A SUPPLEMENT

To Dr. HAMMOND's Paraphrase and Annotations ON THE New Testament.

IN WHICH

His Interpretation of many important Passages is freely and impartially examin'd, and confirm'd or refuted:

And the SACRED TEXT further explain'd by new Remarks upon every Chapter.

By Monsieur LE CLERC.

Englisht'd by *W. P.*

To which is prefix'd,

A LETTER from the Author to a Friend in *England*, occasion'd by this Translation.

LONDON: Printed for *Sam. Buckley*, at the *Dolphin* against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. M.DC.XC.IX.

BODLEIANA · BIBLIOTHECA

A Letter from Mr. Le Clerc *to a Friend in* England, *occasion'd by the Englisſh Tranſlation of his Additions to Dr.* Hammond *on the New Teſtament; with ſomething relating to his* Ars Critica.

HAVING perus'd ſeveral Sheets of an Engliſh Verſion of my Additions to Dr. *Hammond* on the New Teſtament, which were ſent me over, I was well ſatisfied with the care and faithfulneſs of the Tranſlator, not doubting of his exactneſs in the other Sheets, which I have not yet look'd over; but conſidering how unfit Judges of ſuch kind of Writings, thoſe who can read them only in their mother Tongue often are, I could not tell whether I had any occaſion to rejoice. For hereby thoſe things are ſubmitted to the Cenſure of the Vulgar, which are in part above a vulgar Capacity; for there are ſeveral things in this Volume, which, tho render'd into Engliſh, cannot be underſtood but by thoſe who have ſome skill in the Greek Language, and in Heathen and Eccleſiaſtical Antiquities. No others can ſafely enough judg of them, becauſe the force of Arguments many times entirely depends upon knowing the uſe of the Greek Tongue, or Eccleſiaſtical or Profane Hiſtory. Yet no Men determine more confidently of theſe things than thoſe who want that knowledg; becauſe they think themſelves competent Judges of every thing that is written in their own Language. And therefore I have often wonder'd that the learned Man, whoſe Annotations I have tranſlated into Latin, did not chuſe rather to write in Latin, than in Engliſh; when he very well knew that a great many, nay all the beſt things he had written in them, were ſuch as could not be underſtood by mere Engliſh Readers. Beſides, I did not know whether ſome learned Men of your Church-Clergy might think well of a Tranſlation of my Additions; not becauſe I have any where oppoſed the Doctrins of the Church of *England*, but becauſe many, I can't tell why, are diſpleaſed that the Books of Strangers ſhould be read by their Countrymen. I have found this by experience, both before

and not long ſince, when one that was a perfect Stranger to me, without my Knowledg and Conſent, turned into Engliſh the Lives of ſome Fathers that I had written in French a conſiderable time before, in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*. For thoſe Engliſh Lives, which I have not yet ſeen, ſtirred up againſt me the learned Dr. *Cave*, who perhaps would have ſaid nothing about the French Lives; at leaſt he was till that time ſilent, when in truth he had no reaſon to reflect upon me for any thing I had ſaid in them, as I ſhall ſome time or other, and perhaps ſoon, ſhew. And yet there is no man it may be in the Continent, that has a greater value for the Engliſh Clergy, and other learned Men of that Nation, than I, or that ſpeaks or writes oftner in their praiſe; and this not out of Flattery (for what Advantages have I, or can have from thence, who have long ſince ſettled my ſelf in *Holland*?) but becauſe I am really of that mind. And this I have teſtified alſo by my Actions, having tranſlated ſeveral of their Writings into more known Languages than Engliſh, that every one might have the benefit of the Learning of the Engliſh Nation. What therefore can be the reaſon, why ſome Engliſh Gentlemen are unwilling to have my Writings read in Engliſh? I do not know, nor do I think my ſelf concerned to be very inquiſitive into it.

But as I am a lover of Peace, and utterly averſe to all Contention, it would perhaps have been more for my ſatisfaction if I had continued *under the ſhelter*, if I may ſo ſpeak, of the Latin Tongue, and ſo neither feared the raſh Cenſures of the ignorant, nor provoked the diſpleaſure of thoſe learned Men, who would have no body heard but themſelves. Yet ſince I am forced to take my Chance, and the Bookſeller has thought fit to make me appear to his Countrymen in Engliſh, I ſhall ſay a few things to you, as my Friend, by which I may perhaps remove the prejudices and miſapprehenſions of ſome People.

Since my Latin Verſion of Dr. *Hammond* was publiſhed, I find he is become very famous, by that multitude of Copies which have been diſperſed into all parts of *Europe*, and are much uſed by all that ſtudy the Scriptures. But notwithſtanding the eagerneſs of Buyers and Readers, there have been divers Cenſures paſſed upon this my Undertaking. And ſome of them are come to my knowledg, to which I ſhall briefly reply.

There are ſome who would not have had me taken up ſo much time and pains in tranſlating Dr. *Hammond*; but rather my ſelf have written a new Paraphraſe on the New Teſtament, adding thoſe things which I thought were omitted by other Interpreters. Theſe think too favourably

favourably of me, and not honourably enough of the learned *Doctor*. But I who know my ſelf and him better, and underſtand what it is to keep within compaſs, count it an honour to have my fragments added to his completer Labours; if I may but do it with the leave of thoſe who are of a contrary opinion. And that I ſpeak herein ſincerely, and not out of any feigned Modeſty, ſufficiently appears by the great trouble I have taken upon ſelf, more for Dr. *Hammond*'s ſake than my own; for if I had not had a great eſteem for his Writings, I ſhould never have tranſlated ſuch a large Volume; nor would I have added any thing to idle Fictions, or ſpent time in confuting things, the weakneſs of which every one might ſee. And indeed as there are three things requiſite in an Interpreter, without which nothing extraordinary can be expected from him, and which, if any one has, he does ill except he employs them for the publick good; thoſe, in my judgment, were all found in Dr. *Hammond*. To wit, a knowledg of the Tongue wherein the Author writes whom we undertake to interpret, and the Subject of which he treats; a continual and careful reading of that Writer, ſo as to become perfect Maſters of his Stile and Method; and laſtly a ſort of Critical or Grammatical Habit, acquired by long Cuſtom, and confirmed by reading the beſt Interpreters, ſo as to be able to apply what we know of the Language and Things, skilfully and pertinently, whenever there is occaſion.

Dr. *Hammond* was not only a very skilful Divine, but an excellent Grecian and likewiſe Hebrician, the Idioms of which Language are often mixed by the Writers of the New Teſtament with Greek Expreſſions. They that underſtand only ſpeculative Divinity, often ſtumble in particular Paſſages, and many times look for Doctrins, true indeed in themſelves, but nothing at all to their purpoſe, in places where they are not; and know not how to make a right uſe of thoſe places whence they may really be deduced. They are contented not to oppoſe the received Doctrins, and think they cannot do amiſs in ſeeking them any where, provided the words do not too plainly oppoſe it. By which means we ſee the Antient Interpreters of Scripture, both Greek and Latin, becauſe they had no regard to Words or Grammar, but minded only truth of Doctrine, have ſtrangely miſtaken the genuin ſenſe of Scripture. Hence, in part, came innumerable vain Allegories; which I do not call vain, becauſe they contain falſe Doctrins, but becauſe they are grounded upon no certain reaſon. Hence proceeded the violent Interpretations, and pitiful Subtilties, with which the Writings of thoſe Interpreters abound. We need but read St. *Auſtin*'s Commentaries on the *Pſalms*, where we ſhall ſcarce

meet with a page, that has not ſome examples of this kind. Which if it were a true way of interpreting, any thing almoſt might be proved or diſproved out of any place whatſoever. This Dr. *Hammond* carefully avoided, and would have avoided more, if ſome particular things had not a little too often occurred to his thoughts; as *the Hereſy of the* Gnoſticks, *the Deſtruction of* Jeruſalem, and *Church-Diſcipline*; which three things he frequently ſought for, where no body acquainted with the Apoſtles ſtile, had ever before look'd for them, and few again ever will. Yet, as I ſaid before, Dr. *Hammond* does not near ſo often daſh upon this Rock, as the Antient, or moſt late Interpreters, eſpecially thoſe who have written in the laſt Age. I might add this alſo, which is no ſmall commendation of his Annotations, that he follows moſtly that ſcheme of Divinity which is more agreable to Scripture, than the Opinions of many Interpreters, keeping a middle way between thoſe who deduce a ſort of fatal Neceſſity from all eternity, of which neceſſity the Mind of Man is a mere Inſtrument; and thoſe, who like the Heathens, are ſaid to deny that Vertue is at all owing to God.

No Man that reads his Annotations can doubt, whether he had that other faculty of an excellent Interpreter, which I ſaid lay in an exact knowledg of the ſtile of Scripture, and cannot be acquired but by a conſtant reading of it. We ſhall find but few Interpreters ſo well acquainted with the Sacred Writings: That frequent and exact comparing of the words and expreſſions of Scripture with one another, which the Reader, upon the firſt opening of the Book, may obſerve, puts this matter beyond all doubt.

The third Qualification, which I ſaid was a Critical Habit of judging concerning the meaning of places, tho it was not ſo great in him as the two former, was however conſiderable. And this I doubt not he attained by a diligent reading of the beſt Writers, eſpecially *Grotius*; and he would have acquired it in a much greater degree, if the conſtant trouble of defending the Church of *England*, againſt ſeveral ſorts of Adverſaries, had not diverted him. But if we compare him with the Antient Interpreters, or with the greateſt part of thoſe who have written in the foregoing Age, we ſhall find *none* among the Antients, and but *few* among thoſe of late, that can be thought his Equals. For the Antients tho they underſtood Greek, truſted more to their skill in Rhetorick than Language; and took more pleaſure in running out into common places, or Allegories, than in ſeriouſly interpreting words and expreſſions. *Origen* and St. *Jerom*, who beſides underſtood Hebrew, did alſo much more ſeldom

ſee

use their knowledg in that kind, than a sort of Eloquence which took much in their Age. And later Interpreters have been more industrious to fill up their Commentaries with their own Divinity, and Controversies with other Sects of Christians, than with strict enquiries into the signification of Words and Phrases. But Dr. *Hammond*, considering what is expected from an Interpreter, and knowing the difference between a Preacher or a Divine, and an Expositor of Scripture, sets himself to perform the part of an Interpreter, and seldom concerns himself about any thing else.

Which being so, it cannot reasonably be said that I have spent my time ill in translating Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations, or in illustrating, correcting, and enlarging them. But as mens Judgments commonly are, proceeding not from love to Truth, but from Passion, I find there are others, who whether really or seemingly, affirm that I am not indeed to be blamed for translating Dr. *Hammond*; but for annexing those things to his Annotations, wherein I often charge him with Error, or do otherwise contradict his Opinion; as if I were bound to assent to all that he says, or ought to have so great a reverence for him, as to be afraid of professing that I think he was mistaken in his interpretation of some Passages.

But to give these Men satisfaction, if they are willing to be satisfied, I would fain know which of the two ought to be most valued, Dr. *Hammond*'s Honour, or Truth? The Reputation of a Man long since dead, and whose Opinions no Law divine or humane obliges us to follow; or the defence of immortal Truth, which we cannot forsake without offending both God and Men? If they are of that humour, that they had rather maintain the Honour of a learned Divine, as I before said, but subject to error, than Truth, they are not fit to be spoken with. I will have no contest with such Men as profess themselves enemies to Truth; but shall leave them, without any reply, to the Mercy of their own perverse Temper. But the Errors, they say, of great Men, ought to be conceal'd, rather than aggravated. I answer, I have no where aggravated any thing, but confuted him in the softest terms, whenever I supposed him in a mistake. However, I don't think the greatest Mens Faults ought to be conceal'd, who the greater they are thought to be, the more liable unwary men are to be deceived by them, and therefore whenever they are out of the way, they ought above all others to be set right again. It is just we should forgive their Mistakes, and bear with their Defects, in consideration of their greater Vertues, and the notable Service they have done the learned World; but we ought not to let Errors

paſs under the diſguiſe of Truths. It becomes all Candidates of Learning, eſpecially thoſe that ſtudy the Scriptures, to endeavour all they can, and contend earneſtly, that Truth upon all occaſions may appear; not that it may be concealed, out of reſpect to any man, or Error receiv'd inſtead of Truth. The only thing juſtly blamable, in thoſe who take upon them to correct the Miſtakes of great Men, is, if they charge them falſly, paſſionately, or maliciouſly, not for the manifeſtation of Truth, but to leſſen their Reputation; or if they endeavour to obſcure their great Excellencies, and ſeverely inveigh againſt ſmall Offences as unpardonable Crimes.

But when Miſtakes in men, that have otherwiſe done great ſervice to the World by their Learning, are modeſtly cenſured, only with this deſign, that others may not follow them in an Error; the Admirers of great Men are ſo far from having any reaſon to complain, that if thoſe great Men themſelves were to live again, they could not, without the greateſt ingratitude, and being chargeable with intolerable Pride, but thank thoſe that had civilly ſhewn them their Error, and ſet them in the right way. Men are not ſo perfect in this World as to be liable to no Miſtakes; and thoſe to whom we give the higheſt Commendations are not ſuch as have never erred, but whoſe Miſtakes are but few, or only in things of little moment. Let us not therefore extol Men ſo, as if the greatneſs of their Judgment, or Learning, had exempted them from the common danger of erring; nor on the contrary, think them excluded out of the number of great Men, becauſe they are convinced of ſome Error. I have ſo high an opinion of Dr. *Hammond*, upon reading over his Works, that I think there have been few Interpreters ever in the World comparable to him; tho I have often differ'd from him, and ſhewn ſometimes that he was miſtaken. So no man has a greater value for *H. Grotius*, or is more forward to commend him, or does it more frequently than I; yet I have ſometimes confuted him, both in theſe Additions and elſewhere, without any abatement of my eſteem or veneration for him. I am none of thoſe, who are always upon the extreams both in applauding men and reviling them. I am for commending, without envy, what is praiſe-worthy; and rejecting, without malice, what is oppoſite to Truth.

But you ought not, they ſay, to have mixed things of another kind with Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations. Why not? for it's true he ought not to have any thing attributed to him that he did not ſay; but in a Work publiſhed ſo long after his death, and that in another language, I don't ſee why I might not add what I thought wanting in him, tho

tho perhaps he himſelf would not have approved of my Additions, if he had been alive. For I did not publiſh this work for his uſe, but of them who are now living, or for poſterity, who may reaſonably have a greater regard to Truth than to Dr. *Hammond*. They who do not like my Additions, may refuſe to buy them. They may get Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations in Engliſh by themſelves. But are there not great Volumes publiſhed both in *England* and *Holland*, in which the Commentaries of learned men both Papiſts and Proteſtantes, greatly differing in their opinions from one another, are printed together? And who even among the Papiſts, was ever diſpleaſed upon that account, or did not rather highly commend the deſign, becauſe by that means what is wanting in ſome is ſupplied by others? But tho I am not always of Dr. *Hammond*'s judgment, yet the differences between us are much fewer, than between the Critical Interpreters of the Old and New Teſtament; and if they had not, I would certainly never have undertaken to tranſlate any thing of his. But becauſe I agreed with him as to the chief points of Religion and the manner of Interpreting, therefore I tranſlated his Annotations, tho I differ'd from him in ſome things. As I would have others bear with me whenever I diſagree with them, ſo I cannot only bear with, but alſo love and reſpect others when they diſagree with me. I count it an honour, as I ſaid before, to have my ſhort Remarks publiſhed with his accurate Labours; but if I may ſpeak a little boldly without offence, I do not think ſo meanly of my own performances as that their value, if it be any, can ſeem e're the leſs by their being joined with Dr. *Hammond*'s. If I had thought ſo, I would never have publiſhed them either together or alone. I might be miſtaken indeed, as all men are commonly dimſighted in that which concerns themſelves; which whether it be true of me, let learned and impartial Readers only judg: but I could not but do what I thought fit to be done.

There is fallen lately into my hands an Engliſh Pamphlet intitled *A Free but Modeſt Cenſure* of ſome Controverſial Books written in Engliſh, and among the reſt of my *Ars Critica*, tho a Latin Treatiſe, and quite of another nature from thoſe Controverſies. To which there is alſo added the Authors judgment concerning my deſign in tranſlating Dr. *Hammond*, of which I ſhall here ſubjoin a few things. That *Modeſt*, but *Free* Writer, whoſoever he be, will not take it amiſs, or at leaſt cannot in reaſon, if I *modeſtly and freely* vindicate my intention. He

ſays, *it is a harmful project to publiſh Dr.* Hammond*'s Annotations on the New Teſtament, and at the ſame time to mix my own Additional Notes with them. This*, ſays he, *is a politick way to promote the Cauſe, eſpecially in* England, *where the Works of that learned and pious Annotator are in ſo great eſteem: When his Criticiſms and Interpretations are blended with the Socinian ones, how eaſily will they be both imbibed together? I thought fit to caution my Countrymen about this hazard, that they may not be betrayed into Error, even the worſt of Errors, whilſt they are intent upon ſtudying the Truth.*

The Cauſe I have undertaken to defend, both in all my other printed Works, and my Additions to Dr. *Hammond*, is no other than the Cauſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; whoſe Authority alone (in matters of Religion) all Proteſtants think is to be regarded and followed, if we may judg of their Opinion by the Confeſſions they ſubſcribe; of which mind I always was and ever ſhall be. I value the Authority of *Socinus*, or any other uninſpired perſons whatever, deſtitute of reaſon, no more than Dr. *Hammond*'s or the *Council of Trent*'s. When I think they agree with Chriſt and his Apoſtles, I aſſent to them; and if not, I differ from them. I never read all *Socinus* his Works, nor like his peculiar Opinions, ſo far as I know them, any more than other mens, whom I judg to be in an Error. Nay, I have ſometimes confuted them, and as I ſee occaſion ſhall confute more of them; not with a deſign to make his Followers odious, or to gain the favour of any Mortal, but to vindicate Truth. However, I am not of their mind who becauſe men err in ſome things, that are otherwiſe obedient to the Precepts of the Goſpel, and look for the coming of Chriſt to judg the quick and the dead, after the reſurrection, by the rule of the Goſpel, and reward the Good and puniſh the Wicked; and think not that they can attain Salvation by any other means, than the Faith they have in Chriſt, as one ſent from God, which Faith alone they hope by the mercy of God, to have imputed to them *for righteouſneſs*: I am not, I ſay, of their mind that ſentence ſuch men to everlaſting Flames, into which they would, if they were able, immediately hurry them, without the leaſt mercy; and in the mean time decree in a cruel manner to perſecute them with Execrations, and Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Puniſhments. I have not *ſo learned Chriſt*, I do not find the Apoſtles ever acted in that manner: and whilſt they are ſilent, and do not lead the way by their Example, I had rather incur the danger of being too merciful, than expoſe my ſelf to the Charge of the leaſt Cruelty and Barbarity. God will much ſooner forgive them

them that heartily love him, that is, who keep his Commandments, and eſpecially that great and ſo often repeated one of loving our Neighbour, their exceſſive Charity, if any Charity can be exceſſive towards men fearing God and Chriſt, tho in ſome things erroneous; than that horrible inhumanity, with which they are frequently defamed, and perſecuted, and forced to endure all manner of Puniſhments, only becauſe they profeſs themſelves not to believe, what they think Chriſt or his Apoſtles never revealed. I had infinitely rather ſtand in the number of the merciful, before the tribunal of the great Judg, than in the company of Perſecutors, whatever their Riches or Honours are in this World. I had rather be in the mean while evil ſpoken of and ſuſpected of Errors, which I am as far from as can be, than appear by any means to countenance ſuch Barbarity.

Nor am I of their mind, who oppoſe thoſe that differ from them with any kind of Arguments, after the example of bad Lawyers, who deny all that their Adverſaries affirm, and affirm all they deny. Truth, in my judgment, can never be well defended but by Truth. Let others contend with Paſſion, and affirm what it is the intereſt of their party ſhould ſeem true, or deny, not that which they are ſure is falſe, but which they think it neceſſary ſhould appear ſo, that their ſide may prevail; as for me I will always ſay what I think true, and ſhall never fear any danger to the Chriſtian Religion from Truth. This was heretofore the mind of a great man, for whom Dr. *Hammond* had always a very high value, whom he often tranſcribed, whom he defended againſt the Calumnies of his Adverſaries, and in whoſe praiſe he every where ſpeaks. All know very well that I deſcribe *Hugo Grotius*, who whenever he thought *Socinus*, or *Crellius*, truly interpreted any place of Scripture, made no ſcruple to follow them; tho he knew at the ſame time that ſome ill minded men reviled him for it. Wherefore Dr. *Hammond* has juſtly more than once pleaded his Cauſe, as every one, that has read over the ſecond Volume of his Works, knows.

I am not at all for diminiſhing Dr. *Hammond*'s Reputation, as I have already ſufficiently declared; I do not deny but he was a *pious and learned* man; nay if I had not thoſe thoughts of him, I would never have undertaken to tranſlate one line of his Writings. But my Animadverſions neither need his Piety nor Learning to make them be read, if they are valuable; and if they are not, *the Learning and Piety* of Dr. *Hammond* will not procure me the Reader's favour: on the

contrary, if I am any where miſtaken, the comparing them with Dr. *Hammond* will but render my Miſtakes the more viſible. But *Socinian* Doctrins, ſays my Cenſurer, will be imbibed with the true. I anſwer, I have before denyed, that I follow *Socinus* as my Guide; but I don't underſtand why this Cenſurer ſhould be ſo much afraid leſt the true Doctrins aſſerted by Dr. *Hammond* ſhould not be effectual to prevent the ill impreſſions, that falſe and *Socinian* Interpretations may make upon Readers minds. If I were to reaſon after his manner, I ſhould ſay that this Cenſurer is a cloſe *Socinian*; who by ſecret methods endeavours to advance the credit of *Socinus* his Opinions. For it muſt needs be a very powerful Doctrine in his apprehenſion, which if any, tho never ſo little, of it be mixed with the Writings of Orthodox Divines, it ſo obſcures all their Reaſons, that whether they will or no, it is *eaſily imbibed*. This way of arguing tends more to magnify and promote, than to depreſs and extinguiſh *Socinianiſm*, againſt which the moſt learned Annotations on the New Teſtament are not, it ſeems, a ſufficient Preſervative. Beſides this, there is another thing which gives ground for ſuſpicion, and it is what my Cenſurer, and other ſuch as he generally ſtand by. To wit, If a perſon be any thing ingenious, or more learned than ordinary, and writes out of the common road, he is preſently a *Socinian*; as if all men of ſenſe muſt needs turn *Socinians*. We have lately had a remarkable inſtance of this in the worthy and ingenious Mr. *Lock*, who, becauſe he reaſons more accurately about many things, than any before him had done, in his Excellent Treatiſe of *Humane Underſtanding*, is immediately cried down as a *Socinian*, by this Cenſurer and others. This is in earneſt to favour the *Socinians*, to make all good wits of their number. Juſt ſuch reports were formerly ſpread of *Hug. Grotius*, and *Ren. Carteſius*; which were no diſgrace at all to thoſe men, but an honour to the *Socinians*. So *Eraſmus* was before charged with *Arianiſm*, by the Monks of thoſe times, and others no better than they; as if it had been impoſſible for a man of his capacity to be *Orthodox*. I am conſcious to my ſelf how far I come ſhort of thoſe great men in learning and natural abilities; but if my Cenſurer was in earneſt in the commendations he beſtows upon me, he muſt needs own, that thoſe endowments of mind which he attributes to me, were alſo the occaſion of my falling into thoſe Opinions, which he calls *the worſt of errors*. But if he only flatter'd me, that he might ſpeak the more ſpitefully of me afterwards, let me tell him, that feigned Reſpect is an argument of very little candour, to ſay no worſe of it.

If

If he will ſay that *Socinus* was miſtaken in a great many things, I fully agree with him; but I can reckon up a great many worſe Errors than his, whereof I ſhall mention but one out of reſpect to my Cenſurer: that is, of thoſe who think men deſerve eternal Torments whom Chriſt never condemned; who by all means perſecute thoſe that differ from them, tho they own themſelves to be as liable to Error as the very men whom they perſecute; who, in a word, think they may upon very ſlight ſuſpicions traduce men that are heartily devoted to Chriſtianity, and ſober in their lives, as a kind of Plagues to be carefully ſhunned. He that does not aſcribe to Chriſt, what he thinks Chriſt never aſſumed to himſelf, if otherwiſe he perform conſtant obedience to all his Precepts which he fully underſtands, may obtain the forgiveneſs of his Ignorance from a moſt favourable and compaſſionate Judg; but he that breaks the Command of loving his Neighbour, which is as clear as the Sun at noon-day, by Slandering, and Bitterneſs, and Cruelty, and dies in thoſe Vices, ſhall never, unleſs a new Goſpel be made for him, be admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Here I might take leave of my Cenſurer; but becauſe he has thought fit to ſet ſuch another mark of Infamy upon my *Ars Critica*, I ſhall briefly ſhew, that he is mightily miſtaken, and did not diligently read what he was reſolved to condemn. He ſays in the firſt place, that my Deſign in that Treatiſe was, by a new and cunning way *to propagate Socinianiſm*. But I who know my own mind and purpoſe a great deal better, utterly deny it: and there is nothing in the thing it ſelf, which argues that I did ſo undeſignedly. My intent was to ſhew how Students might arrive to a ſolid and uſeful ſort of Learning. And therefore I intermixed a great many Examples, taken from things of the greateſt moment, to prove that *Criticiſm* was no contemptible Art.

But my Cenſurer produces ſome Paſſages by which he endeavours to ſhew that my Deſign was to clear the way for *Socinianiſm*; which places I ſhall briefly conſider, that every one may ſee with what Integrity and Modeſty he deſcants upon them.

I ſaid in *Part* 1. *Chap.* 1. §. 3. That many things in the Writings of the Antients had a reſpect to the Opinions of their Times; which muſt therefore be known, that we may underſtand what they mean. *Ita cum Judæorum præcipua in divino cultu ceremonia in ſacrificio eſſent ſita; ideo in Novo Teſtamento omnia fere pietatis officia ſacrificii nomine interdum indigitari.* *So becauſe the chief Ceremony of the Jews in divine*

Worſhip

Worſhip was Sacrificing, therefore in the New Teſtament almoſt all religious duties are ſometimes expreſſed by the name of Sacrifices. Then I add, *Mortem Chriſti ſacrificium quoque vocari, quod fuerit præcipua* ejus pietatis *pars, & quædam habeat ſacrificiis ſimilia: That the death of Chriſt is called alſo a Sacrifice, becauſe it was the chief part of* his Obedience, *and had ſome things in it reſembling Sacrifices.* Here my Cenſurer tranſlated my words ſo negligently, that he renders the Phraſe *ejus pietatis, of that Religion*, as if I had a reſpect to the Jewiſh Religion; whereas I manifeſtly ſpeak of Chriſt's Piety towards his Father. Then hence he infers, that I ſuppoſe the Sacrifice of Chriſt was only a *metaphorical and improper* Sacrifice, to ſide with thoſe that reject Chriſt's Satisfaction. But what kind of Logick is this? That action of Chriſt, by which he principally redeemed men, is called a Sacrifice, by a Phraſe taken from the Cuſtom of the Jews, tho it did not in all things reſemble a Sacrifice: therefore Chriſt did not redeem us. By what revelation came my Cenſurer to know, that to the end Chriſt might redeem men, it was requiſite he ſhould be ſlain juſt like a Victim, without any manner of difference? And how will he prove that there was every thing in the death of Chriſt which was obſervable in a Sacrifice? It's certain the Prieſt and the Sacrifice was not the ſame; the Sacrifice was ſlain in a conſecrated place, the Blood of it was poured out at the foot of an Altar; and many other Rites were uſed, none of which, properly ſpeaking, were obſerved in Chriſt's Crucifixion. Notwithſtanding which, the Death of Chriſt might have all the efficacy of a Sacrifice. It is fit, for my Cenſurer's information, to obſerve that we are not to ſeek for all the circumſtances of a Sacrifice in the death of Chriſt; becauſe in ſo doing men often mix their own rotten Inventions with divine Revelation: as for inſtance, ſome inconſiderately ſay, that the Croſs was an Altar; whereas there neither was, nor could be, any Altar in this Oblation, upon which the Sacrifice was to be conſecrated; as it was in the Levitical Sacrifices. But this every one knows, and I would not have mention'd it, but that my Cenſurer ſpeaks as if he was ignorant of it. As for his ſaying that what I affirm of the word Sacrifice being attributed to the Death of Chriſt, is nothing to the buſineſs of which I undertook to treat in that place of my *Ars Critica*, I leave that to the examination of the Reader. I have not ſo much time to ſpare, that I ſhould always be teaching the Elements of Logick or Grammar.

In

In Part II. §. 1. c. 3. I have put it beyond all doubt, that *tho the most high God is stiled by the Jews* Elohim, *yet that word signifies God, as he is the object of Worship, σεβαστον, not his most perfect Nature.* I have shewn also that the word θεὸς was used by the Jews that spake Greek, by the Gentiles and the Christians themselves in the same sense; which is of no small use to the understanding of innumerable Passages in antient Writers, both sacred and profane, which would otherwise be very obscure. Nothing can be more evident; and the design of the whole Chapter, to those who are not wilfully blind, is very plain. The thing it self is not opposed by my unknown Censurer, because it is undeniable, and is confirmed by the Consent of the most learned men; but he suspects that my design in writing it was, *to intimate that tho our Saviour might be the object of divine Worship, yet that he is not God.* Whether he speaks as he thinks I cannot tell, be that to himself; but I beseech him never to treat any other man at the same rate as he has done me. For to pretend to know the secret designs of Men, is not only *immodest*, but *senseless*; and in this matter I assure him he is utterly mistaken. I never thought Christ might be *the object of divine Worship*, tho he was not God: that would be mere Idolatry. Nay, the *Socinians* themselves do not say that Christ ought to be worshipped as the most high God, while they do not think him to be the most high God; but only with such a Worship as is due to an Ambassador from the supreme Majesty. I would have my Censurer read their Books before he undertakes to oppose them; and not attribute to me what neither I nor any man else ever imagin'd. It is not the part of a *modest* Man to cavil at what he does not understand, nor of a man of Candor, to misrepresent other mens Principles.

In the following Chap. IV. I said I did not think there was any Emphasis in this Phrase, *thou shalt die the death*, Gen. ii. 16. but that it signified simply, Death; and I rejected both the Opinion of S. *Austin*, who looks here for I know not how many kinds of Death, and those who interpret it of Mortality, which Interpretation I affirmed *to be contrary to* the constant use of the Hebrew Language. What says my Censurer to this? Does he shew that Use is against me? Does he prove that I was mistaken? By no means; but he contends that I side with a Party, *viz.* of *Socinians*; as if there were not learned Interpreters of all Parties that reject that Interpretation; which can be defended by no Example, but only by weak Arguments. Besides, for my Censurer's satisfaction, tho I do not think Mortality is there meant,

yet

yet I doubt not but *Adam* was immortal before he ſinned, and that he really became mortal by Sin, which he might have underſtood from my Commentary on *Gen.* iii. 19.

In the ſame Chapter I proved by manifeſt Examples, not only out of Heathen Writers, but out of S. *Paul* and *Joſephus*, that the Phraſe *to write laws in the heart*, in *Jeremiah*, is not to make them *neceſſarily* be obeyed, but only remembred without a Monitor. My Cenſurer ſays, that the Prophet ſpeaks of the New Covenant, which I never denied; then he adds, that this Phraſe ſignifies that *by virtue of the holy Spirit the underſtandings of the faithful are ſo enlightned, and their wills and conſciences ſo effectually wrought upon, that they are enabled to obſerve the Law.* But by what undoubted Example does he prove this? None at all. Nor could it any more than that irreſiſtible efficacy, be demonſtrated by any Theological Arguments. But I have proved by examples out of St. *Paul* Rom. ii. 15. and *Joſephus*, that that Phraſe is not to be ſtrained too far. And as to St. *Paul*'s words, my Cenſurer ſays nothing, only he denies that examples taken out of Heathen Writers are any proofs; as if I had produced none but them. Then he ſays that in the paſſages of *Joſephus*, the *Writing of the Law in Mens Minds, and the preſerving it in their Memories*, ſeem to him to be two diſtinct things. But let the Reader conſult thoſe places, and he will wonder at the ſhrewdneſs of this *free Cenſurer.*

I ſaid that by this Phraſe of St. *Luke* in *Acts* xvi. 14. *The Lord opened her Heart, that ſhe attended to thoſe things which were ſpoken of* Paul, was meant no more than that, by *divine Providence it came to paſs*, (quibuſcunque tandem machinis uſus ſit Deus) *whatever engines God made uſe of that* Lydia *attentively gave ear to St.* Paul: As ſufficiently appears by the foregoing Examples. My Cenſurer thinks this to be a ſtrange expreſſion, *quibuſcunque tandem machinis uſus ſit Deus*; as if any that underſtood Latin did not know it to be a metaphorical Phraſe taken from Cities, are batter'd with *Engines.* And my uſing ſuch a Metaphor cannot ſeem ſtrange to thoſe, who have read in St. *Paul* 2 *Cor.* x. 4. that *the Weapons* of the Apoſtles *warfare were not Carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of ſtrongholds.* For why may not I uſe ſuch another Metaphor, and ſay *Engines?* Who, beſides, that has any thing of Learning does not know that the beſt Latin Writers uſe that word in this Metaphorical ſenſe? Let my Cenſurer read but this Paſſage of *Cicero* in Epiſt. xviii. to *Brutus: ad reliquos his quoque labor mihi acceſſit, ut omnes adhibeam* machinas, *ad tenendum adoleſcentem.* But would you know, good Sir, what thoſe *machines* were, which God

made

made uſe of *to open the Heart of* Lydia, ſeeing I have not expreſſed my Mind more clearly in my *Ars Critica?* Why they were thoſe *ſpiritual Weapons* of St. *Paul*, by which *be pulled down ſtrong holds*; namely, the Goſpel, which opens the Hearts of its Hearers, unleſs they are wilfully ſhut againſt God's call. So the *Jews* ordinarily ſaid that *the Law opened their Hearts*, as you may be informed by *Lud. Cappellus* on *Luke* xxiv. 25. A ſort of Inſpiration whereby God works upon all the hearers of the Goſpel, to enable them to receive it as they ought, if it be not their own fault, or upon ſome only, whom he irreſiſtibly works upon, is no where intimated in Scripture, as ſome of the moſt learned Men have long ſince ſhewn, whom my Cenſurer may read. Whereas he ſays that I inſiſt upon the ambiguity of the words *to redeem*, and *Spirit*, on purpoſe to patronize *Socinianiſm*, that is but the repetition of a Calumny which he brings over ſo often as to make it nauſeous. He can't deny that what I ſaid is true, but to leſſen my Reputation, he pretends I wrote it with an ill deſign. I muſt undoubtedly, to pleaſe him, not only have reviled the *Socinians*, but made my ſelf alſo a Liar, or concealed the Truth, that they might be the more eaſily refuted, or rather ſeem to be ſo. Then the commendableneſs of my deſign would have made all my diſſimulations and falſhoods praiſe-worthy: But theſe are the tricks of a Man whoſe own Conſcience condemns him, and who is a great favourer of the *Socinian* cauſe, whilſt to undiſcerning Perſons he ſeems to oppoſe it. Which if it was not my Cenſurer's deſign, as I will not affirm; at leaſt he manages things ſo, that it is as eaſy to ſee he is as unfit a Man to put an end to that Controverſy, as he is good at detracting and calumniating.

In *Cap.* vii. I ſhewed that ὁ φύσει θεὸς are properly Gods, by the inſtitution of Men, or ſuch as are accounted Gods. *And yet*, ſays my Cenſurer, *ſuch was our Saviour, ſay the Socinian Maſters, he is a God by divine Inſtitution.* Therefore hence he ought to have inferred, if he would be conſiſtent with himſelf, that it was not my deſign to gratify the *Socinians*, whom yet he unfitly compares to the Heathens.

In the viiith Chapter I ſaid that irreſiſtible *Grace*, which is aſſerted by S. *Auſtin*, did not ſeem to me to be agreable to Scripture; and that the word *Grace* had no evident meaning in it. My Cenſurer does not prove the contrary, but endeavours to make me odious, for ſaying that St. *Auſtin was a popular Speaker, but no Critick.* As if that were not a thing very well known to all that have read his Works, or as if any doubted of it. I eaſily believe my Cenſurer never read St. *Auſtin*'s works, in which I deal more fairly with him, than he does with me. Otherwiſe I

ſhould ſay that either he had no knowledg at all of the Holy Scriptures, or a great deal of impudence, who ſhould attribute to St. *Auſtin* a critical Skill, and that in the Scriptures (for here the Diſcourſe is about the interpretation of Scripture) and endeavour to make me ill thought of for denying it. He calls him *a pious and learned Father*, which titles he gives to Dr. *Hammond*, whom he knew to be of a contrary opinion. But in this matter St. *Auſtin* neither thought *piouſly*, nor wrote *learnedly* of God. And as little *picty* or learning does he ſhew in his Epiſtles to *Boniface* and *Vincentius*; where he zealouſly defends Perſecution on the account of Religion, and that with very abſurd Arguments. He was one of the very firſt that promoted ſome two Doctrins, which take away all Goodneſs and Juſtice, both from God and Men. For by the one God is repreſented as creating the greateſt part of Mankind to damn them, and ſentence them to eternal Torments, for Sins committed by another, or which they themſelves could not avoid; and by the other, Magiſtrates, and all that have the Adminiſtration of publick Affairs, are ſtirred up to perſecute thoſe that differ from them in matters of Religion. However that firſt Doctrin might be born with, becauſe if any Man raſhly ſhuts others out of Heaven, and erroneouſly reflects upon the Goodneſs and Juſtice of God, provided he does not perſecute thoſe that differ from him, and force them to profeſs themſelves of his Opinion; he does more hurt to himſelf than others, becauſe God is nevertheleſs Gracious and Merciful. But he that is for being cruel to thoſe that differ from him, does miſchief both to others, and to the Truth. He makes himſelf a Beaſt, and forfeits eternal Happineſs, which is promiſed to reaſonable Creatures, not to Savages; he perſecutes the innocent, and expoſes them to innumerable Calamities; in fine, he diſparages Truth, if he defends it by ſuch Methods; and if he oppoſes it, he profanes the moſt Sacred thing in the World, and fights againſt God who is its Author. And this is no vain fear about what perhaps will never be; we have reaſon to be afraid leſt St. *Auſtin*'s Authority ſhould move Chriſtians to perſecute one another for differences in Religion. The thing is actually come to paſs already; for a certain great and powerful Monarch, in whoſe Kingdom many thouſands of Proteſtants lately lived, was chiefly by that Father's Authority moved to attempt and execute thoſe things; for which all *Europe* has juſtly rung with the loud Complaints of poor wretches that have been forc'd to fly their Country. It's certain the French King, who is otherwiſe no Tyrant, could not by any means have been induced to cancel all his paſt Edicts in favour

of

of the Reformed; and make use of the barbarity of Souldiers, to extort from them a confession which none of the Clergy of that Kingdom could by all their false reasonings bring them to, unless it were after the forementiond Letters of St. *Austin* had been read to him, whose Authority, being imposed upon by Flatterers, he thought he might safely follow. Let my Censurer go now and resent my being so hardy as to say the truth of St. *Austin*. I speak in that manner, who do not use, like many others, to calumniate the Living, and speak untruths in favour of the Dead.

My Censurer pretends, that in *Chap.* ix. where I said that Philosophers and Divines often use words that have no meaning in them, and which if any one desire them to interpret, they can give no solid answer, for which I instanc'd in the words *Transubstantiation* and *Consubstantiation*. My Censurer, I say, pretends that I have a respect also to the *Trinity*, and other particular points belonging to the same matter. This forsooth is that *modest* Censurer, otherwise called *Searcher of Hearts*, who can divine what other Men think, tho they are never so profoundly silent. Were I to make a Conjecture from what he has written, I should say that he did not only exterminate Charity, but even Justice and Truth out of the number of Christian Vertues. But I had rather think he erred through I know not what Passion, that hurried him to the violation of those Duties of Religion, which he himself accounted the most sacred.

My Interpretation of the words *Righteousness of God*, in *Chap.* xii. 17. for God's righteous Precepts, has no affinity with the peculiar Doctrins of the *Socinians*, unless it be in the brains of a Man that sees things where they are not, and has conceived such a dreadful Notion of the *Socinians*, that upon the least noise he presently imagins a whole Army of them to be coming upon him. I am sure *Crellius* and *Schlichtingius*, their chief Leaders, give us a quite different interpretation of this place.

In *Chap.* xiv. I did not say that St. *John* had the same thoughts of the eternal *Reason*, as *Plato*; but only called the Divinity which dwelt in Christ, Λόγος, in a *Platonical* manner; and added, that it remained to be enquir'd whether S. *John* understood that word in a Platonical sense, plainly intimating that I thought the same word might be taken in different notions. I said also that if that word were to be understood in a Platonical sense in St. *John*, we should be forced to go over to the *Arians*; which, according to the opinion my Censurer represents me to be of, no Man in his wits would say it were necessary to do.

xxi But this ſearcher into Hereſies forgot that *Platoniſm* or *Arianiſm* was very different from *Socinianiſm*. And he knows not, or makes as if he did not know, that I have in a particular Diſſertation, explained the beginning of St. *John*'s Goſpel, in a ſenſe contrary to *Platoniſm*. Whereas I ſaid that all Chriſtians do at this day very much differ from the Opinion of the *Nicene* Council, he knows that can be manifeſtly proved from Engliſh Books, not to mention Latin. He knows very well that the learned Dr. *Cudworth* has proved that the *Nicene* Fathers, and others, thought the three Hypoſtaſes to be three equal Gods, as we ſhould now expreſs it. Let him read alſo the Life of *Gregory Nazianzen*, which I have written, and has been tranſlated into Engliſh, if he does not underſtand French; and he will find that *Gregory* was undoubtedly of that Opinion. The thing is ſo clear, that it cannot be queſtion'd by thoſe who have conſider'd it. But of this elſewhere.

In *Chap.* xvi. I rejected the myſtical and high flown interpretations, and *ſynopſes* of the Antients which are deſtitute of reaſon; and I ſtill reject them, with all the beſt Interpreters of Scripture. I value Rhetorical Arguments, which depend only upon the Speakers fancy, and are not to be tried by the rule of right Reaſon, no more than my Cenſurer's Calumnies, which are the products of his own fruitful brain. Such is his ſaying that I rejected the Rhetorical Diſcourſes of the Fathers, becauſe I think all things to be clear and plain in Chriſtianity, and that no Myſtery is to be admitted. Of which there is not ſo much as one word in that Chapter, where I ſpeak of vain Rhetorick, and not of the obſcurity or perſpicuity of Religion. I never thought we had a clear and perfect Notion of all things revealed, as I have ſufficiently ſhewn in the 2*d Part* of my *Ars Critica*, where I treat of *clear and adequate Notions*. My Cenſurer, who knows the ſecret Thoughts of mens Hearts, ought to have known what I had written in a Treatiſe he took upon him to cenſure. But he read it only to find matter of Calumny, not to do himſelf any good by it.

What I ſaid about *Concrete* and *Abſtract* Notions in *Part.* ii. c. 5. let my Cenſurer read over again a little more ſedately; and he will find I had great reaſon to ſay that the names of Synods were names of abſtract Ideas; becauſe many attributed to them things which rather ſhould have been in them, than which really were ſo, to heighten their Authority to the prejudice of Religion. The *Council of Trent* is alone enough to ſhew the neceſſity of this Obſervation. But theſe Leſſons were written for the ſake of ſuch as love Truth; not

ſuch

such as are ready to defend or oppose any thing for Reward.

In the viiith *Chap.* of the same Part, I said that all Men had not the same Notion of God, but some a larger and more noble one, and others a meaner and more contracted one, of which I alledged very plain examples, which I thought were almost useless, because no Man that had the least knowledg of Mankind could have any doubt of it. But this Censurer neither understood what I said, nor himself, while he affirms that these are *no very reverent thoughts of God.* They only think irreverently of God, who either worship Idols, or after they have endeavour'd, without any regard to Truth, Justice or Charity, to defame Men that fear God, think they have deserved well of Religion and their Country, and that therefore those Revenues are due to them, which the Piety of the Antient Christians instituted only in favour of good and learned Men, not of Slanderers.

Afterwards my Censurer upbraids me for reciting in *Part* iii. several places of the New Testament, wherein the Discourse is of Christ, corrupted by bad Men in the antient Copies, whether they thought well or ill of Christ; which I did not enquire into, nor did I deduce any Consectary, relating to any Theological Doctrin, from thence. He does not shew that there was no alteration made in those Copies, because he could not; but he interprets all these things in a bad sense according to his custom. What he himself thinks of these things, I cannot tell, nor am I concern'd to know; but I must needs says he defends the Cause which he affirms to be the best, both here and elsewhere, just as the most desperate Causes use to be defended; that is, by concealing Truth, and endeavouring to make those who declare it, as odious as is possible. Which whether it be for the honour of a Party, I leave him to consider, and those whose province that is.

At last he concludes his unjust Accusations with an Observation, which effectually confutes almost all he had said before: to wit, that I have alledged nothing new in favour of the *Socinians* about those places, nor endeavour'd to confute Bishop *Pearson*, and Bishop *Stillingfleet*. For thence he ought to have inferred, that I had another design, which I should not have executed otherwise than I have done, if there had never been any *Socinians* in the World. My intention having been only to shew the use of Criticks in things of the greatest moment, and if I am not mistaken, I have reached my end. The rest of what my Censurer says, has either been already confuted, or does not deserve consideration.

This,

This, worthy Sir, is what I thought fit to say of Dr. *Hammond* and my *Ars Critica*, which I had a mind should be published, that the World might have this Testimonial of my Intentions, not to engage my self in a Quarrel with my Censurer; who if he be not brought to righter Apprehensions by what I have here said, no Arguments would ever convince him. Let him now call himself to an account for his Accusations, and not hope that God should be propitious to him, unless he repent of his unchristian Behaviour; which I speak with so hearty a good will to him, that I earnestly pray God not to lay this thing to his charge, but rather reduce him to a better Mind.

YOURS,

Amsterdam,
Jan. 25. 169½.

J. LE CLERC.

Errata.

P. 3. lin. 8. r. *their bold*. P. 48. l. 8. r. *deep rooting, or like weeds*. P. 95. l. 16. r. *Vers.* 51. P. 214. l. 13. f. *has not* r. *had*. P. 234. l. 14. f. *Ibid.* r. *Vers.* 28. *Note* h. P. 473, and 475. run Tit. r. *COLOSSIANS*. P. 545. l. 18. r. *compared [illegible] former, yet they*.

ADDI-

ADDITIONS TO Dr. *HAMMOND's* ANNOTATIONS ON THE New Testament.

Addition to the Annotation on the Title of the whole Book.

TO this which Dr. Hammond *has observed of the word* διαθήκη, *if we add what is said of the same word by* Grotius, *there will remain but this one thing further to be noted, whereby many places of Scripture, yea the whole Christian Doctrin may be illustrated: Namely, that the word* διαθήκη, *in whatever sense it be taken, is metaphorical, and borrowed from the Customs of Men; for Covenants and Testaments properly so called, are only made amongst Men. Now Metaphorical Terms are seldom grounded upon a perfect Similitude between those things, to which they are indifferently applied; and therefore they cannot always be strued up to the whole Latitude of their natural signification. It is sufficient if there be any Agreement, tho but small, between*

tween the thing, of which any word is used in a metaphorical sense, and that which it properly signifies. So that all that can be inferred from the bare word, is, that the several things expressed by it, have some affinity with one another. And in order to determin wherein that similitude lies, we must carefully consider both things themselves: Which being done, we may argue from the thing to the signification of the word, but not from the word to the thing.

So that from the sacred Writers calling the Laws of God διαθήκη a Covenant *or* Testament, *this only in the first place can be concluded, that there is some likeness between the Laws of God and Covenants or Testaments. But that we may distinctly know wherein that likeness consists, we must first consider in what manner God deals with Men, setting aside all metaphorical Notions, and looking as narrowly as possible into things themselves; then we must enquire what Men do when they enter into Covenants, or make Testaments; and lastly, by a comparison of both, we may gather the true sense of the metaphorical Word or Phrase. So that they labour in vain, who whilst things themselves remain obscure, deduce as many Similitudes as they can from words.*

Now if we consider the way in which God deals with Men under the Gospel, and then think what is ordinarily done in Testaments, we shall find that there is only this similitude between the Gospel and a Testament, that in both there is something given, and in both Death intervenes. So that wherever the Gospel is called a Testament, provided the Speaker can be thought to have a clear knowledg of things themselves, only one or other of these will be signified. For this is also to be carefully observed, that the mind of the Speaker must be known before any thing be affirmed of it; for tho two things agree in many particulars, yet we often think but of one, or a few of them, and would not always have them all urged. To illustrate this by an example, It appears from the place in Heb. ix. 16, 17. *which Dr.* Hammond *here interprets, that the Sacred Writer only compares the Gospel and a Testament so far, as there is a Death and Gift in both. And therefore the signification of the word* διαθήκη *ought not, as to those words, to be extended any farther. In like manner,*

manner where it is taken for a Covenant, *it is not to be inferred that all those things are to be ſought for in God's Oeconomy, either Old or New, that are obſervable in Covenants, and that every thing muſt be interpreted according to the Notion of a Covenant. From a ſteddy conſideration of the thing it ſelf, it appears that God's Diſpenſations are nothing but Laws: And therefore whatever is ſaid about fœderal Signs, by which God and Men do more cloſely bind themſelves to one another, being beſides Scripture, and not to be certainly concluded from the word* Covenant, *is perhaps to be reckon'd among thoſe things, which Divines have more ſubtilly invented than ſolidly proved. God has no where declared that it was his deſign to deal with Men ſo as that all his Diſpenſations ſhould perfectly reſemble Covenants, even in the ſmalleſt Circumſtances.*

But perhaps ſome may reply that ſometimes neither the mind of the Speaker, nor things themſelves are ſufficiently known to us, and ask what we are to think then of the ſignification of words: I do not ſee what elſe can be done in ſuch a caſe, than to determine nothing raſhly as if it were certain. It is undoubtedly the part of a wiſe Man to refrain from judging of what is doubtful, and I confeſs I do not know, in this dark ſtate of Mortality, what can be ſafer than laying ſuch a reſtraint upon our ſelves. But this Doctrin will pleaſe but few, becauſe moſt Men love to conceal their Ignorance, and had rather ſeem learned than really be ſo. This may ſuffice to have been ſaid once for all about an over ſubtil interpretation of metaphorical words, that I may have no occaſion to inculcate it.

Addit. to the Remark on the words κατὰ Ματθαῖον in the Title of the firſt Goſpel, after theſe words, *ſtill remaining to us.*] Barnabas *who wrote in the ſame Age with St.* Matthew, *Ep. Cath. c iii. cites this Goſpel in theſe words:* Attendamus ergo, ne forte, ſicut ſcriptum eſt, *multi vocati, pauci electi,* inveniamur. Let us take heed therefore, leſt we ſhould be found as it is written, *many are called, but few are choſen. Theſe words are twice found in St.* Matthew *Chap. xx.* 16. and *xxii.* 14. *and in no other place of Scripture. For it is obſervable that St.* Matthew *is here cited as Scripture, as that*

form of Speech, SICUT SCRIPTUM *est, manifestly shews: whence we may infer in how great Esteem this Gospel was, as soon as ever it was published. Hence it came to pass that when* Barnabas *his Sepulchre was thought to have been found out by Revelation, by* Anthemius *Bishop of* Salamis *in* Cyprus, *it was feigned that St.* Matthew's *Gospel was found also on the breast of* Barnabas, *written in Tables of Thyne wood (*Thyinis tabulis.) *See* Theodor. Lector Lib. 11. *at the beginning: and* Nicephorus Callist. Lib. xvi. c. 37. *and* Suidas *on the word* θυΐνα. *It is reported also that the same Gospel was carried by* Bartholomew *into* India, *that is* Æthiopia, *where it was found by* Pantenus *Catechist of the Church of* Alexandria, *under the Reign of* Commodus: *see* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. c. 10. *These things, whether true or no, shew that the Antients thought this Gospel was written before the others, and that the Apostles carried it about with them.*

ANNO-

ADDITIONS

To Dr. HAMMOND'S

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *Matthew.*

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THO ילד which is properly *to bring forth*, metaphorically ſignifies *to effect*, yet it does not thence follow that תולדה *Tholedah* ſignifies *every event*; for the Metaphors of derivative words are often different from thoſe of their Primitives. In all the places that the Doctor alledges, *Tholedah* plainly ſignifies *the origin of a thing*, which the *Greeks* call γένεσις. If *Gen.* ii. 4. & v. 1. be examin'd, it will appear, that the meaning of the ſacred Hiſtorian is *this*; viz. that *that* was the *origin* of the World and Mankind which he had deſcrib'd. Chap. xxxvii. 2. *Theſe are the generations*, refers to what goes before; and the meaning of *Moſes* is nothing but *this*, that the Anceſtors of *Jacob* were the ſame with thoſe of *Eſau*, whoſe Genealogy he had declared in the Chapter immediately preceding. So *Numb.* iii. 1. *The Generations of Moſes and Aaron* ſignify their *origin* from the Tribe of *Levi*. In the ſame ſenſe we meet with the word γένεσις ſeveral times in *Homer*:

Ὠκεανὸς θ' ὅσπερ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται.

The Ocean from which all things had their origin.

And elſewhere, ſpeaking of the *Ocean*, he calls it θεῶν γένεσιν, *that from which the Gods had their origin.* Βίβλος γενέσεως therefore, as *Grotius* very well interprets it, is *a deſcription of the Origin*, which title muſt be reckon'd prefix'd only to *this* Chapter.

Chapter I. Verſ. 8. Ἰωρὰμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὀζίαν.] Here are three Kings left out, *Ahaziah*, *Joas*, and *Amaziah*. Again, St. *Luke* reckons up nineteen Generations of *natural* Deſcendents from *Salathiel* to *Joſeph*, whilſt St. *Matthew* numbers but *ten*, according to *legal* extraction; the *latter* muſt needs have omitted *ſeven* perſons likewiſe in his *laſt claſs* of Generations. Concerning theſe Omiſſions, many make divers Conjectures. That of *Grotius* is generally look'd upon to be the beſt; that St. *Matthew* kept to the number of Generations in the *firſt* claſs from *Abraham* to *David*, which was *moſt* known, for *memory* ſake, in the *reſt*; and ſo it was neceſſary that ſome Generations ſhould be omitted, that there might be juſt three *fourteens*. But it does not ſeem probable at all to others, that the *Evangeliſt*, merely for the ſake of keeping to the number of *fourteen*, ſhould deſignedly paſs over *ten* perſons, and eſpecially in that part of his Computation in which it behov'd him to uſe the *greateſt* exactneſs, becauſe it was *leaſt* known; for *till* the time of the Captivity, the Genealogical ſeries of the Royal Family of *David* was very well *underſtood*, but from that time to *Chriſt* it was known but *obſcurely*. Beſides, a perſon cannot be ſaid to *retain* any Genealogy in his *memory*, that out of fifty perſons, or thereabouts, *omits* ten; and if the Genealogy of Chriſt muſt needs have been divided into *certain claſſes*, it was not therefore neceſſary that a *fifth* part of his Anceſtors ſhould be paſs'd over to make a diviſion into *fourteens*, when it had been eaſy to make *another* diviſion. This made a very good *Friend* of mine think that St. *Matthew* lighted upon a genealogical book of *David*'s family that was defective; and accidentally obſerving there three claſſes of *fourteen* Generations between theſe three great periods of time, *viz.* before the ſetting up of the Regal Government, during its continuance, and after its fall, was thereby mov'd to make *ſuch* a diviſion in his account of *Chriſt*'s Lineage; which he would not ſo much as have *thought* of, if he had made uſe of an entire Book. There was no reaſon, he ſaid, to wonder at his *ſaying* that a genealogical Book might be *corrupted*, ſince a very great and conſiderable Error, that had formerly perplex'd the Antients, and by that appears to be a very *old one*, was crept into the 11*th* verſ. of St. *Matthew*'s Text *it ſelf*, and *that* notwithſtanding his accurate enumeration of perſons, and *indication* of their number. And *hence* alſo he thought it was, that there are ſome perſons omitted in 1 *Chron.* iv. 1. as likewiſe in *chap.* vi. in the recounting of *Aaron*'s Race, which *Grotius* upon this place obſerves. But this is ſubmitted to the Judgment of the learned Reader. Yet it *looks* as if *Matthew* did in the 1*ſt* verſe cite *a Book of the origin of Chriſt*, from whence he took *all* that follows as far as verſ. 16.

Verſ.

Chapter I.

Verſ. 16. Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.] There are ſome Manuſcripts in which the words Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος are wanting, becauſe the Tranſcribers thought them too languid; but in moſt of 'em, and thoſe the oldeſt, they are found, as alſo in the antient Verſions. That *Chriſtian* who inſerted a Paſſage concerning *Chriſt* into *Joſephus*'s Antiquities, *lib.* 20. *c.* 8. did likewiſe make uſe of the *ſame* Phraſe; upon which *Origen* againſt *Celſus* ſays, *Joſephus* wrote that *the Jews were oppreſs'd with ſo many evils for the bold attempts upon* James *the brother of Jeſus,* τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ, *that was call'd Chriſt*, lib. 1. p. 37. concerning which place, ſee *Tan. Faber* in his Critical Epiſtles.

Verſ. 18. Εὑρέθη] i. e. *it fell out or happen'd* that ſhe was big with child. *So* the word is taken in *Apollodorus*, Biblioth. lib. 1. c. 4. ſ. 2. where he treats of the *ſtrife* between *Apollo* and *Marſyas*; διαφορὰς κρείττων ὁ Ἀπόλλων, *when Apollo had overcome.*

Verſ. 19. *Note* g.] To the Examples brought by *Grotius* and *our Author*, add this one more out of *Terence*, Heaut. *Act.* 4. *Sc.* 1. where the Wife thus beſpeaks her Husband:

Mi Chreme, fateor, vincor; nunc hoc te obſecro
Ut meæ ſtultitiæ in juſtitia tua ſit aliquid præſidii.

Ibid. *note* h.] *Salmaſius* ſeems rather to be in the right, who in his *Comment. de Helleniſtica Præf.* after he had obſerv'd that δειγματίσαι ſignifies to *puniſh*, becauſe *Puniſhments* are δείγματα *examples*, in *which* ſenſe it is often met with in the *antienteſt* Greeks, remarks that among the more *modern* it has the ſignification of *expoſing to ſhame*; which he promiſes to confirm in another place by *examples*, and to ſhew that it ought to be *ſo* taken in St. *Matthew*. He adds, that if the *Evangeliſt* had meant by it a *capital puniſhment*, he would rather have ſaid, μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματισαπδῶναι, *being unwilling ſhe ſhould be puniſh'd.*

This Remark of *Salmaſius* is confirm'd by an example out of *Plutarch*, *lib. de curioſitate*, p. 520. where he ſays that a perſon who is prying and inquiſitive into the evils of *other men*, is like one that ſhould have a Book full of *Homer*'s Verſes without a *beginning*, of *tragical* Incongruities of Speech, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἀκολάστως εἰρημένων, ἑαυτὸν δειγματίζοντος: *and of thoſe things which were indecently and filthily ſpoken againſt women by* Archilocus, *by which he traduc'd himſelf*, that is., *made himſelf infamous*, becauſe ſuch foul Speeches could come from none but a lewd and impure perſon.

Chapter II.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 2. *Note* c. NEW *Stars*, among the Gentiles, were ſometimes look'd upon as *Omens* that the Infants born at the time of their appearance ſhould arrive to great power. See my Note upon *Num.* xxiv. 13. But whatever truth there was in ſuch *Omens*, it was only underſtood and brought to mind after thoſe Infants were *actually* poſſeſs'd of the ſupreme Authority; for no Aſtrology can aſſure ſuch a thing any length of time before-hand. *Suppoſe* a new Star appears upon the birth-day of any one; was there no other Child born in all the Country, beſides that *one*, on that day? Or is it written upon the Star in ſuch characters as the reſt of Mankind cannot underſtand, but are eaſily legible by *Aſtrologers*, that it appear'd in honour of ſuch a *particular* Infant?

There is no recurring here therefore to *Aſtrology*; no more than to *Balaam's* or any *ſuch* like *prophecy*, which had been too dark to help the Wiſe-men, upon ſight of the Star, to *divine* that there was a *King* born to the *Jews*. It is much more credible, that they had been warn'd of it by a heavenly viſion, as afterward *v.* 12. they are admoniſhed to return another way into their own Countrey. *However* this Star was no *Comet*, for Comets are too high, to mark out *certainly* ſo ſmall a place as a little Houſe. It ſeems to have been a *firy meteor* that was miraculouſly ſo long preſerv'd, and appear'd in the *middle* of the Air like one of thoſe we call *falling Stars*, or the *like*. This is the likelieſt account of this matter; but it may not be unuſeful, to ſhew out of a very learned Gentleman of *Ireland* what Arguments there are to ſupport *their* opinion who attribute ſomething here to *Aſtrology*, and the rather becauſe there is ſomething in *his* Opinion that is very well worth our obſervation, and of *ſpecial* uſe in the Interpretation of Prophecies. It is Mr. *Henry Dodwell* in his 2*d* Letter of Advice. His words are theſe.

[*Firſt* therefore, I ſuppoſe that God did intend the *Prophecies* which were committed to *writing*, and enrolled in the *public Canon* of the *Church*, ſhould be *underſtood* by the Perſons concerned in them. For otherwiſe it could not properly be called a *Revelation*, if after the diſcovery things ſtill remained as intricate as formerly. And it is not credible that God ſhould publiſh Revelations only to *exerciſe* and *puzzle* the induſtry of human enquiries; or as an evidence of his own knowledg of things exceeding ours (tho indeed that it ſelf cannot be known by

by us unleſs we be able to diſcern ſome ſenſe which otherwiſe could not have been known than by ſuch Propheſies) much leſs to give occaſion to *Enthuſiaſts*, and *cunningly deſigning Perſons*, to practiſe *ſeditions* and *innovations* under the pretence of *fulfilling Propheſies*, without any poſſibility of *rational confutation* by the *Orthodox*, who upon this ſuppoſal muſt be preſumed as ignorant of them as themſelves: and there is no prudent way of avoiding this *uſeleſneſs* and *dangerouſneſs* but by rendring them intelligible to the Perſons concerned. And *Secondly*, the Perſons concerned in theſe kinds of *Revelations*, cannot be the *Prophets themſelves*, or any other *private Perſons* of the Ages wherein they were delivered, but the *Church in general* alſo in *future Ages*. For as *Propheſie* in general is a *gratia gratis data*, and therefore as all others of that kind given *primarily* and *originally* for the *publick uſe* of the *Church*; ſo certainly ſuch of them as were committed to writing, and deſignedly propagated to *future ages*, muſt needs have been of a *general* and *permanent concernment*. And *Thirdly*, the Church concerned in thoſe *Propheſies*, cannot only be thoſe Ages which were to ſurvive their accompliſhment, but alſo thoſe before; and therefore it cannot be ſufficient to pretend, as many do, that theſe Propheſies ſhall then be *underſtood* when they are *fulfilled*, but it will be further requiſite to aſſert that they may be ſo before. For the only *momentous reaſon*, that muſt be conceived concerning theſe, as well as other Revelations, muſt be ſome duty which could not otherwiſe have been known, which muſt have been ſomething *antecedent*; for all *conſequent* duties of *patience* and *reſignation* are common to them with other *Providences*, and therefore may be known in an *ordinary way*. Now for *antecedent* duties, ſuch as ſeem to be intimated in the *Propheſies themſelves* where any are mentioned, nothing can ſuffice but an *antecedent information*. Beſides, to what end can this *poſtnate* knowledg ſerve? For ſatisfying *Chriſtians* of the *Divine preſcience* upon the *accompliſhment* of his *Predictions*? This is *needleſs*; for they already profeſs themſelves to believe it. Is it therefore for the *conviction* of *Infidels*? But neither can this be preſumed on a *rational account*. For how can it be known that a *prediction* was fulfilled when it is not known what was predicted? Or how can it be known what was predicted when the prediction is ſo expreſſed as to be capable of *many ſenſes*, and no means are acknowledged poſſible for diſtinguiſhing the *equivocation*? Nay, will not ſuch a *deſign* of *ambiguity* ſeem to ſuch a Perſon ſuſpicious of that *ſtratagem* of the *Delphick Oracles*, to preſerve the reputation of a *Prophetick Spirit* by a proviſion beforehand for avoiding the danger of *diſcovery*? for indeed this kind of Propheſie will be ſo weak an argument for proving *Divine Inſpiration*, as that indeed

Chapter II.

Chapter II. deed it may agree to any natural Man of *ordinary prudence*. For in *publick affairs* (the subject of these Prophesies) which proceed more *regularly*, and are less obnoxious to an interposition of *private Liberty*, the *multitude* who are the causes of such Revolutions generally following the *complexion* of their Bodies, and therefore being as easily determined, and therefore predicted from *natural causes*, as such their *complexions*; it will not be *hard*, at least very *probably*, to conjecture *future contingences* from *present appearances* of their *natural causes*. And then by foretelling them in *ambiguous expressions*, he may provide that if any of those senses, of which his words are capable, come to pass, that may be taken for the sense intended; so that a mistaking in all but one would not be likely to prejudice his credit. And at length if all should *fail*, yet a *refuge* would be reserved for their *superstitious reverencers* of his *Authority*, that themselves had rather failed of understanding his *true sense*, than that had failed of *truth*. Especially if among a multitude of attempts, but *one* hit in *one sense* (as it is hard even in a *Lottery* that any should always miss, much more in matters capable of *prudential conjectures*) that *one* instance of *success* would upon those accounts more *confirm* his credit than a *multitude* of *failures* would *disparage* it; because in point of *success* they would be confident of their understanding him rightly, but in *miscarriages* they would lay the *blame*, not on the *prediction*, but their own *misunderstandings*. Now seeing this way is so very easily pretended to by *Cheats* beyond any probable danger of discovery, it cannot to persons not already *favourably affected* (who only need *conviction*) prove any Argument of a *Divine Inspiration*, and therefore will, even upon this account, be perfectly useless. Supposing therefore that it is necessary that these predictions be understood *before*, as well as after that they are *fulfilled*; it will follow *Fourthly*, that where they were not *explained* by the *Prophets themselves*, there they were intelligible by the use of *ordinary means*, such as might, by the Persons to whom the Revelations were made, be *judged ordinary*. For that they should be explained by *new Prophets* to be sent on the particular occasion, there is no ground to believe; and if these Prophesies were so expressed as that they needed a *new Revelation* for *explaining* them, they must have been useless, and indeed could not have deserved the name of *Revelations*, they still transcending the use of *human means* as much as formerly. For if they had been revealed *formerly*, what need had there been of a *new discovery*? And if this need be supposed, it must plainly argue that the former *pretended Revelation* was not sufficient for the information of mankind in the use of *ordinary means*; and that which is not so, cannot answer the *intrinsick ends* of a *Revelation*.

This

This therefore being supposed, that *old Revelations* are thus intelligible without *new ones*, it must needs follow that their explication must be derived from the use of *ordinary means*. And then for determining further what these *ordinary means* are that might have been judged such by those to whom these Revelations were made, I consider *Fifthly*, that this whole indulgence of God in granting the Spirit of Prophesie was plainly accommodated to the *Heathen* practice of *Divination*. This might have been exemplified in several particulars. Thus First, the very practise of revealing *future contingences*, especially of *ordinary consultations* concerning the affairs of *private* and *particular persons*, cannot be supposed grounded on *reason* (otherwise it would have been of *eternal use*, even now under the *Gospel*) but a condescension to the *customs* and *expectations* of the Persons to whom they were communicated. And Secondly, that an *order* and *succession* of *Prophets* was established, in *Analogy* to the *Heathen Diviners*, is by a very ingenious Person proved from that famous Passage of *Deut.* xviii. 15, 18. to which purpose he also produces the concurrent Testimony of *Origen cont. Cels.* L. 1. And thirdly, that the sense of the *Platonists* and other *Heathens*, concerning *Divine Inspiration*, its nature and *parts* and *different degrees*, and *distinction from Enthusiasm*, does very much agree with the notions of the *Rabbins* concerning it, will appear to any that considers the Testimonies of both, produced by Mr. *Smith* in his excellent Discourse on this subject. Hence it will follow Sixthly, that, as this Divination of which they were so eager, was originally *Heathenish*, so they were most inclinable to make use of those means of understanding it to which they had been inured from the same principles of *Heathenism*; especially where God had not otherwise either expressly provided for it, or expressly prohibited the means formerly used; and those Means, others failing, were most likely by them to be judged ordinary. And that *Oneirocriticks* were the proper means among the *Heathens* for explaining their *Divinatio per somnium*, answering the *Jewish* degree of *Prophesie by Dreams*; and indeed the principal Art of the *Harioli* and *conjectures* concerning *Visions*, as far as they held Analogy with those Representations which were made to other less prepared Persons in their sleep, will not need any proof. It might have been shewn how the principal Rules of the *Jewish Cabbala* were very agreeable to the like Arts of Tradition among the *Heathen*, and among them were a curious mystical kind of Learning contrived for maintaining a conversation with their Gods; wherein as they were imitated by the *Gnosticks*, so these Rules themselves were derived from the *Heathen occult Philosophy*. And certainly it is most likely to have been some kind of expressing and explaining

Chapter II.

Dr. *Stillingfleet's Orig. Sacr.* l. 2. c. 4. N. 1.

Chapter II.

plaining *Prophesies*, and some kinds of *Learning* subservient thereunto, which was so solemnly studied by the *Jewish* Candidates for *Prophesie* in their *Schools* and *Colleges*, and which made it so strange, that Persons wanting that preparation, such as *Saul* and *Amos*, should be by God honoured with it. Besides that we find the punctual fulfilling of several predictions of the *Chaldeans* by virtue of their *Oneirocriticks* (those most eminent Transactions of the Conquests of *Cyrus*, and the Death of *Alexander* the Great, were thus foretold) plainly implying that God himself, as he designed those *Dreams* to be *Divinatory*, so he observed the *Oneirocritical Rules* in their signification. For it is not probable that Revolutions managed by such special designs, and signal interpositions of *Divine Providence*, could have been foreknown or signified by the *Devil*, he being frequently put to his solemn shifts of *equivocation* for concealment of his ignorance in affairs of *greater moral probability*, and consequently of *easier prediction*. And it cannot seem more strange that God should observe the Rules of *Oneirocriticks* and *Hieroglyphicks* in his *Responses* when made use of with a pious design by his own people, than that he should answer the *Heathens themselves* in their own practice. Thus he observed the sign proposed by the *Philistins* for discerning the true reason of their sufferings, 1 *Sam.* vi. 2, 9, 12. and met *Balaam* in the use of his *enchantments*, Numb. xxiii. 4, 16. and revealed our *Saviours Nativity* to the *MAGI by the means of a STAR*. And particularly for *Oneirocriticks*, their sutableness to this purpose will not be scrupled by them who admit the Testimony of *Trogus Pompeius*, who ascribes the first invention thereof to the *Patriarch Joseph*, which will be very congruous to that prevailing Opinion among the *Fathers*, and many late *excellent Authors*, that all *Arts* were derived originally from the *Jews*. Besides, *Daniel* who was so famous for expounding *Dreams*, tho he was thought by the *Heathens* to do some things by the *Inspiration of the Holy Gods*, Dan. v. 11. yet had *Chaldean education*, Chap. i. 4. and was a *great proficient* in it, vers. 17. and was accordingly included in the decree for *killing the Chaldeans*, Dan. ii. 13. and was therefore, after his *miraculous* interpretation of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s Dream, promoted to be *Master of the Magicians*, *Astrologers*, *Southsayers and Chaldeans*, Dan. v. 11. and therefore certainly was thought, in things not exceeding the power of the Art, to have proceeded according to its Prescriptions; that is, in the *interpretation*, tho not in the *discovery*, of the Dream it self. And they, as well as the *Jews*, being concerned in the *event* of his Prediction, must also have been so in the *understanding* of them. So also *Moses* being expresly affirmed *skilful in all the learning of the Egyptians*, must therefore be presumed skilful

Somniorum primus intelligentiam condit. Trog. ap. Justin. Hist. *l.* 36.

ful not only in their *Hieroglyphicks*, for which they are ſo commonly famed, but alſo in *Oneirocriticks* to which they were alſo addicted, as appears *Gen.* xli. 8. And methinks that challenge made in the *Revelation* concerning the *name of the Beaſt*, that *here is wiſdom*, and that *he that hath underſtanding* ſhould *exerciſe himſelf in counting the number thereof* (as it ſeems plainly to allude to the *Cabaliſtical* way of finding out *Names* by *Numbers*, whereof we have among the Heathens a *precedent* in *Martianus Capella*, who thus fits the *names* of *Mercury* and *Philology*, to ſhew the congruity of their Marriage, beſides very many more in the *Gnoſticks* in St. *Irenæus*, ſo) ſeems to imply that it was, tho hardly, in the exerciſe of this Art, diſcoverable even by human wiſdom. Certainly St. *Irenæus* underſtood him ſo when he attempted to unriddle him by finding out names, whoſe numeral Letters, in the *Greek Tongue* wherein the Challenge had been made, might amount to ſuch a number. I do not, by all that has been ſaid, intend that all *Prophecies* are explicable by any *Rules of Art* or *ſuitable Conjectures*. I know many of the *Heathen Oracles* themſelves were not. The Oracles expounded by *Themiſtocles*, *Curtius*, *Nebrus*, &c. did not depend on *Art* but *Luck*. My meaning is only concerning the *Prophetick Viſions*, and only thoſe of them which are left *unexpounded by God himſelf*, but are to be preſumed ſufficiently intelligible in the uſe of *ordinary means*.] Chapter II. Rev. xiii. 18. L. 2.

Thus far *Dodwell*, who adviſes them that ſtudy Divinity to read thoſe Writings of the *Antients*, which concern the critical knowledg of *Dreams*, and the interpretation of *Oracles*, as that which would be of uſe to 'em in the underſtanding of obſcure Prophecies. But as it is with great modeſty that he propoſes this, and only as a *conjecture* which he ſubmits to the Learneds examination; ſo *I* ſhall alſo leave the Reader to his own Judgment about it.

Ibid. προσκυνήσαι.] About the ſignification of this word, conſult *Grotius* upon this place, and upon the ſecond precept of the *Decal.* It being uſed promiſcuouſly in *Scripture* to ſignify both *Divine* Worſhip, and alſo that Honour which we give to *Men*, becauſe in the Eaſt the ſame geſtures of Reverence were uſed towards *Men* as towards *God*, 1 *Chron.* xxix. 20. it is not credible it ſhould here be taken for an act of *divine* Worſhip, for the Wiſe-men did not know *Jeſus* to be the *Son* of *God*, but only that he would be a very great *King*, and therefore they gave that Honour to him which us'd to be ſhewn to *Eaſtern Monarchs*. And for this reaſon I ſhould decline the uſing of the word *adorare* here, which tho it had heretofore a *doubtful ſenſe* amongſt the *Latins*, yet now by the uſe of the Schools is made to ſignify only *di-*

Chapter II. vine *Worſhip*. And therefore it is alſo a fault in the French Verſions, where this word προσκυνῶν is all along tranſlated *adorer*, which in the French Language does by no means belong to *civil*, but *Religious* Worſhip only; it being altogether incredible, that *all* thoſe who proſtrated themſelves at the Feet of *Jeſus*, knew him to be the *Son* of *God*, who might and ought to be honour'd with *divine* Worſhip. And indeed what one *Apoſtle* calls προσκυνῶν, another frequently expreſſes by προσπίπτειν *to fall down proſtrate*. See *Matt.* viii. 2. compar'd with *Luc.* v. 12. and ix. 18. compar'd with *Marc.* v. 22. *Luc.* viii. 41. and *Matt.* xviii. 24, 29.

Verſ. 15. Ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν, &c.] Conſult what our Author has upon the 22. *ver.* of the foregoing Chapter, and what *Grotius* before him has collected upon the ſame place. They ſay that there were *two* kinds of Prophecy; the *one* διὰ ῥημάτων, when the event is *directly* foretold, the words referring to *that only*; the *other* διὰ πραγμάτων, when the words of a Prediction are *ſo* conceiv'd, as to reſpect indeed *primarily* a *certain event*, but yet *ſo alſo* as to ſhadow out ſomething that is of *greater importance*. So *Hoſea* ſpake indeed *directly* of the Iſraelites; but becauſe the bringing of the People of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt* was a type of *Chriſt*'s return out of the ſame Country into *Judea*, therefore in ſpeaking of the *type*, he is to be thought to have ſpoken concerning the *Antitype* alſo.

But there are a few things to be obſerved with relation to this matter, which the moſt learned Interpreters have paſt by.

Firſt, to uſe the inſtance of *Hoſea*, it muſt be confeſs'd that no body living in that Age could have poſſibly diſcern'd any *prediction* in thoſe words of his, but by an intimation from the *Prophet* himſelf; *viz.* that tho he ſpake of a thing that was paſt, yet he had his mind upon an event that was to happen at ſome Ages diſtant, of which the former was a typical repreſentation. Otherwiſe, who could in the leaſt *ſuſpect* that there was any Prediction latent in a ſimple relation of matter of Fact? *Iſrael was a Child, and I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.* No body ſure will ſay, that the *Jews* who were far from being a ſubtil People, could ever of their own heads, without any advertiſment, have diſcover'd *here* a Prophecy. The ſame we are to think of all other Prophecies of this kind.

2*dly*. Since it is no where found in the old Teſtament, that any ſuch *Intimation* or *Advertiſment* was given, either we muſt acknowledg that no Prophecy *being* διὰ πραγμάτων could be underſtood by the *Jews* before the *event*; or elſe that the Prophets did privately inſtruct their Diſciples, if not alſo *admoniſh* the common People, that whenever they recounted

recounted any of *God's* paſt favours, or when they ſpake of themſelves, they had in their minds a reſpect to ſomething *future*. Nay it was neceſſary they ſhould have *particularly* and *ſeverally* interpreted every Prediction of that kind, and pointed to the *event* which it had a reſpect to; for otherwiſe *who* could be ſo ſubtil as between two not much *differing events*, to diſcern which of 'em was deſigned in the Prediction? But the firſt of theſe having been confuted by Mr. *Dodwell*, we muſt neceſſarily admit *the latter*, and ſay that there remained among the *Jews* in Chriſt's time ſeveral traditions concerning the *ſenſe* of Prophecies, handed down from the *Prophets* themſelves. The reaſon why they did not commit thoſe traditions to writing, I confeſs I do not clearly ſee, but it does not follow from thence that there were *no* ſuch unwritten *Doctrines*. Nor do I deny but that this way of teaching had its *inconveniences*, and that ſome *falſe* opinions might creep in amongſt the true traditions; but our enquiry is not what would be moſt *convenient*, or what we our ſelves ſhould have done, but what *was* done; which is the *only* thing to be conſidered in ſearching into Antiquities. Chapter II.

3*dly*. The ſame we muſt think of the *types* and of *typical Predictions*, for no body that was not firſt warn'd could ever underſtand thoſe things that were done, or which came to paſs, to have been *repreſentations* of things *future*.

4*thly*. Unleſs theſe things be ſo, all the uſe of thoſe typical Predictions muſt have been confin'd to thoſe to whom they were explained after the *event*, which how ſmall that is, appears from what we have cited out of Mr. *Dodwell* at the 2*d verſ*. And not to repeat what has been ſaid by him, I might at leaſt gather from hence, that no Arguments could be brought from that ſort of Predictions to convince *Infidels* by; and whatever weight they had among *Chriſtians*, it was intirely owing to the Authority of the *Apoſtles*, and not to the Evidence of the Arguments. For it is manifeſt to all that underſtand *Hebrew* that the *Prophet* ſpeaks concerning *Iſrael*; and that he ſhould, *ſpeaking* of *their* going out of *Egypt*, have had a reſpect to *Chriſt's* return into *Judæa*, would have been impoſſible for us to know without a Revelation. And therefore we muſt be oblig'd to ſay that the *Prophets* left their *Diſciples* a *Key*, *q. e.* by which to unlock their Predictions, which would otherwiſe have been ſhut up out of every body's view. And had not this been ſo, it is certain the *Jews* could *never* have grounded their expectations of a *Meſſias* upon ſome places in the *Prophets*, out of which no ſuch matter could be fetch'd by the mere aſſiſtance of *Grammar*; nor would the *Apoſtles* have cited them as making for their purpoſe. For both the formers had made themſelves ridiculous if

Chapter II. they had neglected the *grammatical ſenſe*, and recurred, without any other reaſon than their own fancy, to a more *ſublime* one; and the latter had been but ill Diſputants, to produce ſuch Paſſages as might be *hiſs'd at*. The Authority of the *Apoſtles* ought not here to be objected, as that which added ſtrength to their Reaſonings; for they *themſelves* did not rely upon their own Authority, but upon the force of their Arguments. You will no where find it ſaid, that Prophecies ought ſo or ſo to be interpreted, becauſe the *Apoſtles*, who were inſpir'd by the Holy Ghoſt, and whoſe Doctrine *God* confirm'd by Miracles, did in that manner interpret them; but this they take every where for *granted*, that they ſhould be *ſo* explained, as they explain'd them from the *receiv'd Opinion* amongſt the *Jews*.

Verſ. 23. *Note* 1.] Many think it ſtrange that the *Prophets* ſhould here be quoted, when no ſuch thing as what is here mentioned can by the help of *Grammar* be deduc'd from any words of the *Prophets*; for there is no place from whence it can be *grammatically* gather'd that the *Meſſias* was to be called by this name of a *Nazarene*. That which is drawn from the *meer* ſimilitude between the words *Netſer* and *Nezir*, is harſh and far-fetch'd. By *what* means therefore could this be deduced from the Writings of the *Prophets?* It muſt be, doubtleſs, by an allegorical Interpretation of ſome place which was vulgarly known in thoſe times, but is not now extant. And this ſeems to be the reaſon why St. *Matthew* did not produce any one *Prophet* by *name*, but ſaid τὸις προφήτας, *the Prophets*, in the plural number, as referring rather to ſome *allegorical* ſenſe than any *Scripture* words, as *Jerom* has well obſerv'd. So the Writers of the *Apoſtolical times* uſed to cite a Tradition *juſt* as if they were the very words of *Scripture*, as we may ſee frequently done in the Catholick Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, Chap. vi. and eſpecially where the Diſcourſe is about the *Scape-goat*. He brings us, as out of the *Scripture*, theſe words, as they are extant in the antient Verſion. *Exſpuite in illum omnes & pungite, & imponite lanam coccineam circa caput illius, & ſic in aram ponatur: & cum ita factum fuerit, adducite qui ferat hircum in eremum, & auferat & portet illum in ſtirpem, quæ dicitur rubus, cujus & fructus in agris adſumus* (leg. *adſolemus*) *invenientes*, &c. *Spit all upon him, and prick him, and put ſcarlet wool about his head, and ſo let him be laid upon the Altar: and when you have done that, bring ſome body that may carry the Goat into the wilderneſs, and take him away and bear him to a plant call'd a Black-berry buſh, the fruit of which we alſo us'd, finding it in the fields*, &c. See alſo what *H. Grotius* has upon *Matth.* xxvii. 9. Juſt ſo *Philo*, p. 5. *de mundi opificio*, cites *theſe* for the words of *Moſes*, Τὸν μὲν ἀόρατον καὶ νοητὸν θεῖον λόγον καὶ ἱερὸν λόγον ἐκ-

κέν-

χόνα ἄϛαι θεῦ, καὶ πάντες εἰκόνα τὸ νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ὁ θεῖος λόγος γέγονεν εἰκών, &c. Chapter III.
That the invisible and intelligible reason, and the reason of God, was the image of God, and the image of this was that intelligible light which was the image of the divine reason, &c. But this is no where to be found in *Moses*. And this is a common practice with him.

That *God* might deprive the *Jews* of all pretence for unbelief, he would have all those things accomplish'd in *Christ* which the *Jews* thought were to be fulfil'd in their *Messias*, which were not contrary to the end for which he sent *Jesus* into the world, *viz.* the Reformation of Mankind, and the making of them happy, whether they were *allegorically* understood from the Scripture, or had their rise from somewhat else *besides* it. Thus because the *Jews* interpreted the lxix. *Psal.* 22. of the *Messias*, *Jesus* knowing that they would give him Vinegar to drink if he said he *thirsted*, said accordingly, he thirsted: *After this Jesus knowing that all things were accomplish'd, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst*, &c. *Joh.* xix. 28. And so likewise at other times he took the occasion of fulfilling certain other *Prophecies* that otherwise were of no such great moment in *themselves*; which the *Apostles* have studiously observ'd. See afterwards *chap.* iv. 14.

CHAP. III.

Vers. 2. *Note* c. IMmediately after that Citat. *Tellus confracta peribit*] To the Collections that learned men have made, that they might shew the meaning of *Isaiah* to be *only*, that *John* was to prepare the way for *Christ*, these Verses may be added out of *Ovid.* lib. 2. Amor. Eleg. xvi.

At vos, qua veniet, tumidi subsidite montes.
Et faciles curvis vallibus este viæ.

The *Poet* here wishes his Mistress a *commodious Passage*, and expresses his desire, by Metaphors taken from what uses sometimes to be done, upon the approach of *Princes*.

Ibid. *at the end of that Note.*] 'Tis a mistake in our Author, when he says that the Hebrew *Judges* were so denominated from their inflicting of Punishments, *i. e.* from the most hateful part of their office. They were called *so* from their *judging* or determining of *Strifes* between the *Jews*, as appears both by the History of *Samuel*, and also of the other *Judges*. This is the proper signification of the word *Judge*, (which

Chapter III. (which has nothing in it to provoke ſpite or ill-will) and from which this term of their Office is more likely to have been deriv'd. This needs no ampler proof, and nothing could have led *our very learned Author* into ſuch a miſtake, but only his earneſt deſire to illuſtrate the Subject he was upon, by too great a plenty of Examples, as his uſual cuſtom is.

Verſ. 4. *Note* e.] We may add to what Dr. *Hammond* has here obſerv'd, theſe Verſes of *Ovid. Faſt.* iv. where he is deſcribing how the firſt men, that ſpent their days in the Woods, liv'd:

Et modo carpebant vivaci cæſpite gramen,
Nunc epulæ tenera fronde cacumen erant.

And a little after,

Pomaque & in teneris aurea mella favis.

Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. lib. 1. relates out of *Hellanicus*, that the moſt Northern People eat of the tops of trees ἀκροδρύοις χρώμενοι.

Verſ. 7. Τίς ὑπέδειξεν.] This Interrogation has the force of a Negation: for St. *John*'s meaning is this; You have *not* been taught by any body, that by my Baptiſm *merely*, without Repentance, you ſhall avoid the Deſtruction that hangs over you, therefore repent, *&c.* Such another Interrogation the Learned think to be that in *Mic.* v. 2. which St. *Matthew* has expreſs'd by a Negation, *chap.* ii. 6. See *Grotius* upon the place. Of the ſame kind is that Interrogation in *Virgil*,

Nam quis te, juvenum confidentiſſime, noſtras
Juſſit adire domos?

i. e. *no body order'd* you, but you came of your *own accord*. See *Iſa.* i. 11, 12. I make this brief Remark, not for any difficulty there was in the thing, but becauſe our Author has not expreſs'd the negative force of the Interrogation in his Paraphraſe, and no body elſe, that I know of, has taken notice of it.

Verſ. 11. *Note* g.] Thoſe that know how very antient the Cuſtom was of purifying by Fire and Water amongſt the Heathens, will hardly give their conſent to what Dr. *Hammond* here ſays, about the *Devil*'s imitating the Baptiſm of *John* and *Chriſt*. See what *Joh. Lomeierus de luſtrationibus* has collected with relation to this matter, *Cap.* xx. There being an evident and experienc'd aptitude in Fire and Water to purge away filth, it is no wonder that they were by many Nations made Emblems of the purifying of the mind.

Ibid.

Ibid. *Note* h.] What our Author ſays here is true; but *raking* together all that ſeem'd to countenance or ſupport his Opinion, he has alledg'd a place out of *Luc.* xxii. 27. that makes nothing to his purpoſe, for *Chriſt*'s meaning is not that he converſed with his Diſciples in the *quality of a Diſciple*, but that tho he was their *Lord*, yet he had choſen rather to *miniſter* to them, than to *exact* any thing from them in an *authoritative* way. See that place. Chapter IV.

Verſ. 12. Τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον.] *Palea*, Straw, is not here intended, for that ſerves for many uſes, and is never burnt; but it is the *Husk*, or that which the Grains of Corn are wrapt up in, and the *beards* or fragments of the ears, which by the *Greeks* are call'd ἄχυα. *Heſych.* Ἄχνη, τὸ ἄχυρον. Ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέῃ. Ἄχνη, a *husk*, is the name of that which is ἄχυρον. We meet with it in a Verſe of *Homer*, Iliad. E. 499.

Ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέῃ ἱερὴς κατὰ ἅλωὰς
Ἀνδρῶν λικμώντων, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ
Κρίνῃ ἐπευξομένων ἀνέμων, καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας,
Αἱ δ' ὑποκαδνίσσουσι ἀχυρμιαί.

As the wind carries the huſks in the ſacred floors, when men are fanning, and when yellow Ceres *ſeparates, the winds violently ruſhing in, the fruit from the huſks, whilſt the places made to receive the huſks wax white.*

The manner of fanning amongſt the *Greeks* is deſcribed by *Xenophon*, in *Oeconom.* pag. 863. *Edit. Wechel.* where we meet with this word ἄχυρον ſeveral times both for the *ſtraw* of Corn, and for a *huſk*. But the *Septuagint* diſtinguiſh them in *Iſa.* xvii. 13. where they call the *huſk* χνῦν ἀχύρου, *the ſmall duſt of the ſtraw*.

Verſ. 16. Ἀνεῴχθησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ οὐρανοί.] I am apt to think there was a parting of the Clouds, and then that a light ſhone very high out of the Sky, as it was in the *Goſpel* of the *Nazarenes*; concerning which matter conſult *Grotius*. *Plutarch* has ſomewhere this Saying, οὐρανὸν ῥαγῆναι δόξαντα, which cannot be underſtood but of a *cleaving* of the Clouds by their *retiring* hither and thither.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 1. Ἀνήχθη εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα.] What is here related, may more eaſily be conceived to have happened to *Chriſt* in a *Viſion* or *Dream*, than *really*. It looks, methinks, very odd, that an *Evil Spirit* ſhould be permitted to have ſuch a power over our moſt holy *Saviour*, as to carry him through the Air; and then that *proſpect* of the Kingdoms of the whole World could no

Chapter IV. no more be ſhewn from a *Mountain* than upon a *Plain:* for what is there to be ſeen from a Mountain, beſides Woods, Fields, Rivers, Villages, Towns, and the like, and thoſe only afar off? But theſe things do not uſe to be ſtiled in any Language, *the Kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.* That which we call *the glory of Kingdoms*, is rather the ſplendor of a *King*, which conſiſts partly in his ſplendid Attire, partly in his Guards or Attendents, and partly in his coſtly Edifices, and other things of that nature. So *the glory of a Kingdom* is taken 2 *Chron.* ix. 25. where *Solomon* is the ſubject of the Diſcourſe; as afterwards here in St. *Matthew*, chap. vi. 29. where the word δόξα is uſed. See alſo *Rev.* xxi. 25, 26. Now it's true, in a *Dream*, the moſt powerful *Kings* of the Earth, *with all their glory*, might be ſhewn to *Chriſt* in a *moment of time*, as S. *Luke* ſays theſe things were, but not if he were *awake* or *from a mountain.* The Phraſe ὑπὸ τῦ πνεύματος therefore, may be interpreted here as St. *Luke* does that of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι *in the Spirit*, i. e. in a *Viſion*, as *Rev.* i. 10. And ſo *Ezekiel* declares himſelf ληφθῆναι ὑπὸ τῦ πνεύματος, ch. ii. 2. & iii. 12. when being in a Viſion he thought the *Spirit took him up.* And chap. xl. 2. we find the ſame perſon again ἐπὶ φαντασίαν (*as he fancy'd*) caught up into a high mountain. And ſo likewiſe St. *John*, Rev. xxi. 10. But however, by this *Viſion* Chriſt might learn that his Life would not be without Temptations, and that he muſt do *really* what he *ſeemed* to himſelf to do in a *Dream*, i. e. ſtrive againſt Unbelief and Ambition.

Ibid. *Note* a.] As *Satan* in Hebrew, ſo διάβολος in Greek imports a *Hater*; for διαβάλλειν does not only ſignify to *calumniate*, but alſo to *hate*; and to this latter ſignification the *Septuagint* ſeem to have had a reſpect, when they rendered שטן by διάβολος, for the Hebrew word ſignifies to *oppoſe* or *hate*, but never to *calumniate*. Of the ſignification of the word διαβάλλειν which I mentioned, we may ſee an example out of *Strabo*, in *Caſaubon*'s Notes upon p. 545. lib. xviii. where he obſerves that it frequently occurs in the ſame ſignification in *Philoſtratus*. In that ſenſe 1 *Mac.* i. 38. *Antiochus* is called διάβολος. To this the word ἀντικείμενος is ſynonimous; of which ſee *Grotius* upon 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 4.

Verſ. 8. Τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν.] *i. e.* the *glory and riches* which he ſaw lying in the vaſt tracts of the earth. So כבוד amongſt the *Jews* ſignifies *glory* and *wealth*. See what I have obſerved upon *Gen.* xxxi. 1. *Apollo* in *Ovid* is repreſented ſpeaking thus to *Phaeton*, whilſt he was looking down from the palace of the *Sun* upon the Earth, *Metam.* l. 2.

—— *Quid-*

— Quidquid habet dives circumſpice mundus,
Eque tot ac tantis cœli, terræque, mariſque
Poſce bonis aliquid, nullam patiere repulſam.

Verſ. 14. ἐπληρώθη] See the Notes upon Chap. ii. 23. *H. Grotius* has obſerved upon *Jam.* chap. ii. 23. that it was common for the *Hebrews* to ſay, that ſuch or ſuch a place of Holy Scripture נתקיים *i. e.* ἐπληρώθη, or was *fulfilled*, whenever any thing came to paſs, reſembling what was mentioned in that place. But he gives us no example of it, and therefore I ſhall produce one out of *R. Salomon* upon *Gen.* xi. 8. where at the words *the Lord ſcattered them abroad*, he makes this remark, בעולם חוה מרה שאמרו פן נפוץ נתקיים עליהם הוא שאמר שלמה מנורת רשע היא תבאנו : *As they had ſaid, leſt we be ſcattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth; ſo that Saying of* Solomon *was verified concerning them, What he is afraid of ſhall come upon him.* And this way of ſpeaking the *Greeks* alſo themſelves uſed upon a like occaſion. *Ælian* lib. iii. c. 29 has theſe words: Διεξιὼν ὁ Σινωπεὺς συνεχῶς ἐπέλεγεν, ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγῳδίας ἀρὰς αὐτὸς ΕΚΠΕΠΛΗΡΩΚΕΙ ᾗ γὰρ πλανὴς, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ οἰκία, &c. Diogenes Sinopenſis *uſed continually to be ſaying, that he fulfilled and underwent all the curſes of Tragedy, for he was a vagabond, and had no home*, &c. *i. e.* that one might ſee ſomething in his condition reſembling that which the Players in Tragedy uſed to wiſh, when they were in a rage, to others. So likewiſe *Olympiodorus*, in the Life of *Plato*, applies to him a Verſe out of *Homer*: Κειμένῳ αὐτῷ μέλιτται περιπεπόηκεν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα κηρίων μέλιτος, ΙΝΑ ἁληθὴς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ῥηθῇ. Τοῦ γὰρ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή. *As he was lying all along, a ſwarm of bees came and filled his mouth with honey-combs*; that ſo that Saying of *Homer* might prove true of him, *From whoſe tongue proceeded a ſound ſweeter than honey.*

Verſ. 15. *Note* e.] Our Author ſhould rather have ſaid, that ſeveral Nations dwelt *in* this Coaſt, than *round about it.* For there were ſeveral Nations that dwelt alſo round about the *reſt* of *Judea.* We ſhall be moſt likely therefore to find out the *reaſon* of this Appellation, by what *Strabo* ſays about the northern parts of *Judea*, lib. xvi. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐπέκεινα, τὰ πολλὰ δ' ὑπ' ἔθνεσιν εἰσὶν ὑπὸ φυλῶν οἰκούμενα μικτῶν ἔκ τε Αἰγυπτίων ἐθνῶν, καὶ Ἀραβίων, καὶ Φοινίκων: *Now theſe Countries lie towards the North, and each of them are moſtly inhabited by a mixt ſort of People, made up of* Egyptians, Arabians, *and* Phænicians.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THis ſame *Hiſtory*, and theſe very Diſcourſes of *Chriſt*, are related by St. *Luke*, chap. vi. but much more compendiouſly, and not ſo diſtinctly; whence we may perceive that the *Evangeliſts* have not reported the very *words* of Chriſt, but only the *ſenſe* of what he ſaid; according as their own or others memory ſuggeſted it to them. And this may teach us that the ſenſe is that which we ſhould principally look to, and that we ought not to *anatomize*, or inſiſt too nicely upon every ſingle word. Otherwiſe we ſhall hardly make the *Evangeliſts* to agree with one another. As for inſtance, *Chriſt* ſays here in St. *Matthew*, verſ. 3. *bleſſed are the poor in Spirit*, but in St. *Luke* this word τῷ πνεύματι is wanting. Now if we take theſe words of St. *Matthew* in the *fineſt* and *niceſt* ſenſe, *Chriſt* will be found to ſpeak here, not of thoſe that are *deſtitute of riches*, but thoſe who in what condition *ſoever* they be are not too much *puff'd up* in their minds. On the other hand, St. *Luke's* words do not properly import humble-minded perſons, but perſons of *mean eſtate*. The like we may obſerve concerning the 6*th* verſe, and abundance of other places, in which the *Evangeliſts* report the ſame thing with ſome variation.

Verſ. 8. *Note* c.] That in theſe words *the pure in heart* have a bleſſedneſs conferred upon them, is plain enough; but what that bleſſedneſs is, is not ſo clear. Of old the *Jews* as well as the *Heathens* thought they might ſometimes have a ſight of the *Gods*. By the *Gods*, I do not mean the very *divine Nature*, but *corporal Shapes* aſſumed by Angels. Yea and ſo the *moſt high God himſelf* (if it was not rather an *Angel* called by his name that appear'd to the *Iſraelites*) gave notice of his preſence by a cloud or by fire, which *form* the *Jews* called by the name of *God*, as appears from the *Pentateuch*. They had a conceit alſo, that if any one ſhould ſee thoſe *forms* againſt the will of the *Gods*, they would certainly die, or loſe their ſight. See my notes upon *Gen.* xvi. 13. And therefore whoever was admitted by any *God* to an interview with him, was look'd upon to be his ſpecial *favourite*; as the Holy Scripture informs us concerning *Moſes*, who went near to the Cloud, in which the *Angel* had wrapt himſelf, and talked with him. Hence, this phraſe *to ſee God* was uſed to expreſs ſome *great happineſs*, even amongſt the *Gentiles*, which gave occaſion to thoſe Verſes in *Virgil*;

Ille

Ille Deûm vitam adſpiciet, *diviſque videbit*
Permiſtos Heroas, & ipſe videbitur *illis*;

and thoſe in *Ovid*,

Felices illi, qui non ſimulachra, ſed ipſos,
Quique Deûm coram corpora vera vident.

Add to this, that becauſe *God* was thought, not only by the *Hebrews* but alſo by moſt *Heathen* Nations, to have his Habitation in a peculiar manner in *Heaven*, and Heaven was eſteemed the ſeat of bleſſedneſs; therefore *to ſee God*, and to be in the ſeat of ſupreme happineſs, came at laſt to ſignify one and the ſame thing. And hence it is ſaid of the *Saints*, Heb. xii. 14. that *they ſhall ſee the Lord*, and 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12. *face to face*, i. e. like *Moſes*, they ſhall be permitted to have an acceſs to the Light it ſelf by which *God* manifeſts his preſence in Heaven; and becauſe they are to ſee him *as he is*, they ſhall alſo, as *Moſes*, whoſe countenance was made to ſhine, become *like to God*, 1 Joh. iii. 2. From this it appears, that if there be any ſolidity in what the Schoolmen ſay about the *beatifick viſion*, they muſt deduce it from *metaphyſical reaſonings*, and not out of theſe places of *Scripture*.

Verſ. 17. *Note.* g.] The *Law* being here ſpoken of, I ſhould rather think that by γεγμμα we are to underſtand the *moſt ſimple*, or that which we commonly call the *Grammatical* or *Literal* ſenſe of the Law, in which reſpect there are innumerable external rites enjoined in it; and that by πνεῦμα is meant the *mind* of the *Lawgiver* lying hid under thoſe ſymbolical Precepts. *Ariſtotle* in *Lib. de repub.* often uſes the word γεγμματα for *written laws*, in oppoſition to the will of the *Governour*, or the interpretation that he puts upon them. So Lib. 2. ch. 9. ἁ ἀνπρνέμανας βέλπιον κείνεσ, ἀλλὰ χ τὰ γεγμμαλα χ τὰς νόμας, *it is not the beſt way to paſs ſentence according to our own will and pleaſure, but by the written Statute and Laws.* And Lib. 3. c. 15. after he had ſaid that the Law ſpeaks of things but in *general terms*, without accommodating it ſelf to particular caſes, he adds, τὸ χ γεγμματα ἄρχειν ἠλίθιον, *that it is a fooliſh thing for a Governour to follow ſtrictly the written law*; and a little after, ἁ ἔσιν ἡ χ γεγμμαλα χ νόμας ἀείσι πολιτεία, *it is not the beſt way of adminiſtring a Commonwealth to keep cloſe to the Letter and the Laws.* So alſo *Cicero* oppoſes the *letter* of the Law to the *intention* of the *Lawmaker*, Lib. 1. de Inventione, cap. 38. *Omnes leges ad commodum Reipublicæ referre oportet, & eas ex utilitate communi, non ex ſcriptione,*

Chapter V. *quæ in literis eſt, interpretari. All Laws ought to be directed to the benefit of the State, and have ſuch a conſtruction put upon them as the publick intereſt requires, without ſticking too cloſe to the letters in which they are written.* See likewiſe Lib. 2. cap. 48. And under this conſideration the Laws of *Moſes* are called γεγράμμα and γεγράμματα, *viz.* when they are underſtood in a *Grammatical* ſenſe; and are oppoſed to πνεῦμα, *i. e.* the deſign of *God* in enacting them. The word *Spirit* is uſed in Scripture to ſignify any thing that is *out of ſight*, in contradiſtinction to what is *apparent* and *conſpicuous*, as the *letters* are of the Law. But this may be more clearly demonſtrated in its due place.

Verſ. 18. *Note.* i.] *Ludovicus Cappellus* in Arcano punct. Lib. 2. Cap. 14. has ſaid enough about this place; and if we conſult him, and join what Dr. *Hammond* and he have obſerved together, we ſhall have as complete a Commentary upon this place as can be deſired. *Chriſt*'s meaning is that none, no not the leaſt *moral* precept, which did not peculiarly reſpect the *Jews* as a *Commonwealth*, but was fitted to all men, and all Ages and Places, of which kind there were many in the Law, ſhould ever be abrogated by *God*. 'Tis as if he had ſaid, that he would be ſo far from licenſing Men to break any of that ſort of Precepts, that he would require an exact performance of the very leaſt of them. As λύσις νόμε ſignifies an aboliſhing of a Law, ſo a Law is ſaid γίνεσθαι, which continues in its full force and obligation. And therefore the phraſe ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται does not ſignify *until all be fulfilled*, but, *but all its precepts ſhall be ſtill obliging*, for ἕως, as *Grotius* has obſerved, has here the force of an *Adverſative*.

Verſ. 22. ὁ ὀργιζόμενος, &c.] Our Author, in his Paraphraſe, partly makes *Chriſt* to ſpeak himſelf directly, and partly inſinuates and intermixes his *own* Remarks with *his* words. But yet I muſt ſay, that this is harſh and forced, as the *Doctor*'s way of expreſſion (no diſparagement to his Learning) commonly is. Beſides, his Paraphraſe upon this period does not make the mind of *Chriſt* clear enough, which I take to be this. " 21, 22. Ye know that Murder was forbidden by " *Moſes*, and that this Law of his threatned Death to the Tranſgreſſors " of it; but let me tell you, that it is not only thoſe heinous ſort " of crimes that will be puniſhed by *God* in another life: Whoever " ſhall but *indulge his anger*, and make a cuſtom of carrying himſelf " haſtily and moroſely to others without reaſon, ſhall have a puniſh- " ment inflicted upon him, comparable to that capital one to which " perſons are ſentenced by the *leſſer Sanhedrim*; and that ſhall be " the lighteſt penalty for Sins committed againſt your Neighbour. " But whoever ſhall be found to have got an ill habit of *mocking and*

" *deriding*

" *deriding* others, shall *in this kind of Punishments* suffer as heavy a one, Chapter
" as that which used to be inflicted by the *greater Sanhedrim* for V.
" the boldest Crimes. But lastly, he that shall accustom himself to
" *rail*, or *revile* other men, shall have a Penalty laid upon him by *God*
" resembling the severest that is us'd amongst Men, such as to be
" burnt alive.

This Doctrine of *Christ* may be referred to *two* Heads, the *former* of which is, that there are some Sins which have no Punishment denounced against them in the Law of *Moses*; and the *latter*, that for *those* very Sins men shall suffer as severe, nay and a severer punishment in the other life, than the Law of *Moses* inflicted for the *greatest* crimes. Which was a very necessary Doctrine for the *Jews*, who thought themselves to be very good men, and to have fulfilled their duty in all points, if they were but safe from any charge being brought against them out of the Law; as is the case of many even at this day, among *Christians*. But then we are not to understand by the Sins here spoken of, *single Commissions*, such as a sudden fit of Anger, *once* mocking, or *one* abuseful Speech rashly thrown out; but a *habit* of being angry, or of deriding and reviling our Neighbour, and continuing in it as long as we live: for single acts of Sin, which we fall into not through a custom in sinning, but through infirmity, are according to the Laws of the *Gospel*-Covenant, pardoned by *God*. That which *Christ* here therefore condemns is, first an *angry Disposition*, or a habit of being easily, and for little or no reason, displeased with others; and then *Pride*, which is, as I may say, the *Parent* of *mocking*; and lastly, both an angry and proud custom of speaking *abusively* or *revilingly*. And indeed, these corrupt Dispositions of the Mind are like so many poisonous Fountains from whence innumerable Evils proceed; for they do not only induce a neglect of the contrary Duties, but are the occasion many times of the greatest Sins. Which I shall not, in these short Παραινετικὰ, at large prosecute.

The names whereby *Christ* describes the Punishments that are to be inflicted for these evil habits in another life, are (as Interpreters, and amongst the rest *Grotius*, who is always to be joined with Dr. *Hammond*, have observed) drawn from the *Jewish* Custom. And it is no wonder; for there were no *peculiar* names given to the unknown and invisible Punishments of the other life; and if *Christ* had called them by any *new* names, no body would have understood him. And therefore he was necessitated to make use of such names and representations of Punishments as were *known* by those he spake to.

Vers.

Chapter V.

Verſ. 28. *Note* o.] *Ovid*, that Maſter in Debauchery, deſcribes this matter to the life, *Metam.* vi. where he ſays of *Tereus* looking paſſionately upon *Philomela*,

Spectat eam Tereus, præcontrectatque videndo.

Verſ. 33. Ἀποδώσεις δὲ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου.] A perſon is ſaid *to pay his oath to the Lord*, that fulfils a Promiſe confirmed by an Oath; becauſe he that calls *God* to witneſs, does not ſo much oblige himſelf to the *Party* he makes a promiſe to, as to *God*. So *Joſhua* kept to the Promiſes he made, in the Covenant entered into with the *Gibeonites*; not for the ſake of the *Gibeonites* who had deceived him, but becauſe of the obligation he was under to *God*, to whom he had appealed as a witneſs. See *Joſ.* ix. 19. This alſo the *Heathens* underſtood, as we may ſee by the words of *T. Quinctius Cincinnatus*, in *Livy* lib. 6. c. 29. when he was going to fight againſt *the perfidious Gauls*: *Adeſte Dii teſtes fœderis, & expetite pœnas ſimul vobis violatis, nobiſque per numen veſtrum deceptis. Be preſent, O ye Gods, that were witneſſes of our League, and revenge both your ſelves for the affront that has been put upon you, and us who have been deceived by your Deity.* And therefore they thought it no ſmall part of *divine Worſhip* to keep their Oaths. *Iſocrates ad Demonicum*: πρῶτον μὲν δίκαιοι τὰ σεβεῖν τοὺς Θεούς, μὴ μόνον θύων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πίστις ὅρκους μένων: *firſt worſhip the Gods, not only by offering Sacrifices, but by keeping your Oaths.*

Verſ. 36. Μήτι ἐν τῇ καταλῇ ὀμόσῃς.] See what *H. Grotius* has upon this place; and to what *he* has obſerved add this Paſſage out of *Athenæus* Lib. 2. p. 66. Ὅτι δὲ ἱερὸν ἐνόμιζον τὸν καταλόν, δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ καὶ καθ' αὑτοὺς ὀμνύειν. Καὶ τοὺς γαυδόμους ὑπ' αὐτῶν πλαγιοὺς σφοδρυνῶν ὡς ἱερέας. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰς συγκαθίσεις βεβαιοῦντας τῇ κινήσει ἐπιδίσει. ὡς καὶ ὁ Ὁμηρικὸς Ζεὺς φησὶν,

Εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι κατάλῃ ἐπινεύσομαι.

But that they eſteemed the Head ſacred, may appear by their uſing to ſwear by it, and to reverence its Sneezings as ſacred: And alſo by its having been a cuſtom to confirm Agreements or Contracts by nodding of it; as Jupiter *ſays in* Homer, *Go to, I will now nod my head.*

Verſ. 39. Στρέψον αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον.] This is a *proverbial* Speech, and ought not to be underſtood *properly*. It ſignifies to expoſe ones ſelf to be *injured* or *vilified*. So *Os contumeliis præbere* is taken in *Livy*, lib. 4. c. 35. where a ſeditious *Tribune* of the People ſays of the Commonalty that aſpired to the *Military* Tribuneſhip, *Petiſſe viros domi, militiæque ſpectatos; primis annis fugillatos, repulſos, riſui Patribus fuiſſe; deſiſſe poſtremò* præbere ad contumeliam os. That *ſuch men had ſued*

for

for it as were approved both at home and abroad; and at first were jeered and repulsed, and made a laughing-stock of by the Fathers, but now at length they were resolved not to suffer themselves tamely any longer to be abused. We meet with it also in *Tacitus* Hist. Lib. 3. c. 31. *Circumsteterunt victores, & primo ingerebant probra, intentabant ictus; mox ut* præberi ora contumeliis, *& posita omni ferociâ, cuncta victi patiebantur, subit memoria illos esse, qui nuper Bedriaci victoriæ temperassent. The Conquerors stood round, and at first heaped Reproaches upon them, and lifted up their hands, making as if they would give them blows; but afterwards when they saw that the conquered let themselves be abused, and laying aside all fierceness, took every thing patiently, it came into their minds that they were those very same persons, that a little before had used their victory at* Bedriacum *with moderation.*

Chapter VI.

Vers. 40. Ἱμάτιον] There is no body that is not a perfect stranger to the Greek Langnage, but knows that ἱμάτιον signifies a *Cloak*, or that Garment which we wear *outermost*, and χιτῶνα a *Coat*, or one *nigher* our Bodies. But if, notwithstanding this is so plain and certain, any one should still be in doubt of it, the best way for him to satisfy himself would be to read *Ælian* Var. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 16. and *Octavius Ferrarius* de Re Vest. Part. 1. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. and Part. 2. Lib. 4. c. 3.

CHAP. VI.

Vers. 7. OF this sort of *Battology*, or idle repeating of the same thing, there are instances also to be found in the ritual Books of the *Jews*; where there are some Prayers *so* composed, as if they thought a *particular* laying open of their requests necessary to make *God* understand them. On the day before that of the *Expiation*, there are Prayers read, wherein in a long series all the kinds of Sins, together with the respective Punishments due to them, are distinctly enumerated. They begin thus: *Let it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our Fathers, to forgive us all our iniquities, and pardon all our offences, and to purge us from all our sins, the sins which we have committed against thee by compulsion, and the sins which we have committed against thee voluntarily and of our own accord, and the sins which we have committed against thee by uncovering our nakedness,* &c. The whole form as it was taken out of the *manuscript Copy* was published by *Selden de Synedriis* lib. 1. c. 12.

Vers. 8. Οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὧν χρείαν ἔχετε.] *Socrates*, as *Xenophon* tells us, lib. 1. *Memor.* p. 420. Ed. Græcæ H. Steph. Εὔχετο θεοῖς τὰ δέοντα ἁπλῶς τ' ἀγαθὰ διδόναι, ὡς τὰ δοὺς κάλλιστα εἰδότας ὁποῖα ἀγαθά ἐστι, *prayed* simply

Chapter VI. ply *to the Gods that they would beſtow* good *things upon him, as knowing themſelves beſt what things were good.* See what *H. Grotius* ſays as to this matter: and hence we may conclude that the *Heathens* did ſometimes ſpeak of things more agreeably to the Precepts afterwards given by *Chriſt* than many *Chriſtians* uſually do.

Verſ. 11. *Note* f.] There is none here but *Grotius*, whoſe opinion is firſt laid down by our Author, that deſerves our regard; and the Doctor had done better if he had only endeavour'd to confirm his interpretation. Every body knows that the *Greeks* uſed the Phraſe of ἡ ἐπιοῦσα χρόνος to ſignify as well in *general* the *time future* as the day *immediately* enſuing, from the verb ἐπειμι *to approach* or *to be at hand.* So *Euripides* in his *Alceſtes*, v. 171. uſes τὸν ἐπιόντα κακὸν for an *evil that is future* or *ready to come to paſs.* So in that place of *Solomon* Prov. xxvii. 1. *Boaſt not thy ſelf of to morrow, for thou knoweſt not what a day may bring forth*; the *Septuagint* have τὴ πέρυσι ἡ ἐπιοῦσα to ſignify the *time future.* The meaning of *Chriſt* therefore is this: "*Give us every day, all the remain-*"*ing part of our lives, as much as may be ſufficient for our ſubſiſtence. Vopiſcus* has almoſt ſuch another kind of expreſſion in the Life of *Aurelian*, where he ſpeaks of the *loaves* that were daily diſtributed to the People: *Siligineum ſuum* (viz. panem) *quotidie toto ævo quiſque recipiebat, & poſteris ſuis dimittebat. Every one daily received his white loaf as long as he lived, and that cuſtom was continued to their poſterity.* Upon this place *Salmaſius* obſerves out of *Chronic. Alexandr.* that ſuch Loaves were called διαυτίζοντες, i. e. ſuch as every one was ſure to have during his Life: ſo that διαυτίζων ἄρτος and ἐπιούσιος ſignify almoſt the ſame thing.

It is likewiſe truly obſerved by *Grotius*, that this word comprehends under it both *food* and *raiment*, *i. e.* all the neceſſaries of Life, which we pray *God* we may never want as long as we live. Our Author makes it to relate alſo to the *mind* or *ſoul*; but without any neceſſity, for thoſe things which concern the *Soul* are contained in the foregoing verſes.

In *Solomon* Prov. xxx. 8. לחם חקי does not properly ſignify *food convenient for me*, but *my allowance or proportion* of it. 'Tis an alluſion of the *Writer of Proverbs* to the cuſtom of thoſe who gave daily to their Servants or others a certain *allowance* which was called חק hhok, *i. e.* as if one ſhould ſay, *appointed food.* See my Notes upon *Gen.* xlvii. 22. Wherefore altho if we conſider the thing it ſelf, the tranſlating of ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος by לחם חקנו *our proportion of bread* may not be much amiſs, as *J. Mercerus* upon the *Proverbs* has obſerved; yet the juſt force of the Greek word will be far from being thereby expreſſed.

Verſ.

Verſ. 16. *Note* h.] Ἀφανίζειν is to make any thing become ἀφανὲς, which is the contrary of both φανὸν *bright* or *ſhining*, and of φανερὸν *conſpicuous*. And hence the *verb* ἀφανίζειν has a twofold ſignification, according as it is either oppoſed to ποιῶν φανὸν to *make bright*, or to ποιῶν φανερὸν *to make conſpicuous*. To begin with the *latter*, a thing *becomes inconſpicuous* ἀφανίζεται, when it is either quite deſtroyed, or elſe *carried to another place*, or *covered*; for which ſenſe there ſeems here to be no room, as has been well obſerved by the Doctor. In the *former* ſenſe of the word, a thing is ſaid to *loſe its brightneſs* ἀφανίζεται, when it is ſome how or other *defiled*. Thus the countenance, when the face is waſhed and anointed, is φανὸς, *ſhines*; and when inſtead of uſing oil to make it ſhine, we *diſfigure* it with Aſhes or Duſt, then ἀφανίζεται. In which ſenſe ἀφανίζειν is the ſame with μολύνειν, *to pollute*, *to defile*. But the *Grammarians* obſerve the ſignification of *polluting* to have been more late, and that of *taking out of ſight* to be the older of the two. Etymol. Magn. Ἀφανίσαι οἱ πάλαι οὐχὶ τὸ μολῦναι ὡς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τελέως ἀφανῆ ποιῆσαι. Ἀφανίσαι *was not uſed by the Antients for* to pollute *as it is now*, *but for* to render wholly inconſpicuous. Concerning the *antient* uſe alſo of this word, *Suidas* muſt be thought to ſpeak when he ſays: Ἀφανίσαι οὐ τὸ μολῦναι οὐ χρῶνται δηλαδὴ, ἀλλ' ὅλως τὸ ἀνιλεῖν οὐ ἀφανὲς ποιῆσαι: *it does not ſignify to defile and pollute*, *but to take quite away and out of ſight*. But of this *later* ſignification of Greek words, diſcerned by the other which *properly* belongs to them, there are abundance of inſtances in the *New Teſtament*, amongſt which the verb ἀφανίζειν muſt be reckoned one. Of this notion of the word the Doctor has given us ſeveral examples, and one out of *Nicoſtratus*, whoſe words he ought to have ſet down at their full length, for he underſtands them in a ſenſe quite contrary to the intention of the Author. He is ſpeaking concerning Women that had too great a paſſion for Ornaments, and brings reaſons to diſſwade and reclaim them from it. Πόῤῥω δ' ἂν εἴη, ſays he, οὐ τῆς ὑγιαινούσης γυνὴ ὑγιαίνουσα, οὐ ψιμυθίου, οὐ ὑπογραφῆς, οὐ ἄλλου χρώματος ζωγραφοῦντος οὐ ἀφανίζοντος τὰς ὄψεις: *Far be it from a healthful woman to think ſhe has any need of white paint*, *or red*, *to put under her eyes*, *or any other colour*, *in order to daub and pollute the face*: not *to make it more beautiful*; for that is againſt the Writer's *deſign*, and contrary to what this Verb conſtantly ſignifies. And that this word ἀφανίζειν is uſed by *Chriſt* in the ſenſe of *polluting*, and denotes a purpoſed endeavour to deform the face, is manifeſt from the manner of the oppoſition: *When ye faſt*, *be not as the Hypocrites*, *of a ſad countenance*, ἀφανίζουσι γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν, *that they may appear unto men to faſt*; *but thou*, *when thou faſteſt*, *anoint thine head*, *and waſh thy face*. It is as plain as the Sun at Noon-day,

 that

Chapter VII. that an *anointed head* and *waſhed face* is oppoſed ἀφανιδίῳ προσώπῳ, i. e. *a dirty unwaſhed face*, and one that *is not anointed*; ſuch as theirs uſed to be who faſted in ſackcloth and aſhes. About *anointing* the face with oil, in order to make it the more ſhining, ſee *Pſalm* civ. 15. and what Interpreters ſay upon that place. But this uſed to be neglected by Mourners, as appears from 2 *Sam.* xii. 20. So that tho what Dr. *Hammond* ſays upon this place contains a great many learned things in it, and is worth our reading, yet he has certainly miſs'd the ſcope of it.

Verſ. 22. *Note* l.] Our learned Author is miſtaken in the ſenſe he puts upon the words of *Heſychius*; for that which that Grammarian ſpeaks of is *the ſoundneſs of the body*. See my Notes upon *Levit.* xxi. 17. It is moſt true that ἁπλῆς ſignifies *liberal*; but that Virtue, as on the *contrary* an envious and ſordid way of giving, or *alſo* a denying any charitable aſſiſtance, is imputed to the eye; becauſe there is a mighty diſcernible difference between the looks of a man that gives chearfully and willingly, and one that either belies himſelf in ſaying he has nothing to give, or elſe gives but ſparingly and unwillingly. It would be needleſs to go about to confirm what is plain from the Teſtimonies of the Antients; I ſhall only obſerve that *oculos dolere* was a *Latin Phraſe* applyed to a perſon who could not, without regret, behold what another poſſeſſed, becauſe that Paſſion chiefly diſcovers it ſelf in the eyes. See *Plautus*, *Aſinar.* Act. v. Scen. 1. v. 4. and upon that place *Fr. Taubmannus*.

Verſ. 27. after the words *proportionable ſtature*.] Τετράγωνος in Greek, and *Quadratus* in Latin, does not ſignify as *broad as high*, which is abſurd, but a juſt Stature. Conſult *Conſtant. Lexic.*

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 4. Τί ἴδιον.] Τί for ὡς *Grotius* tells us is after the manner of the *Helleniſts*, i. e. of the *Jews*, who ſpake Greek not ſo correctly as they ſhould have done, and produces Examples of it. But *Salmaſius*, in the Epiſt. Dedic. to his *Commentar. de Helleniſt.* ſays, that he elſewhere proves it to be *Alexandrian*. Where this proof is I cannot tell; but it is enough to juſtify its being called a *Helleniſm*, if it be but improper Greek, and has ſomething diſcernible of a *Hebraiſm* in it. The Hebrews uſe מה to expreſs τί and ὡς, which it is no wonder if he that interpreted S. *Matthew* imitated. Now the reaſon why the Gate that leads to Happineſs is ſaid by *Chriſt* to be *ſtraight*, is becauſe as men live, it lets in

in but few. The ſame ſimilitude is made uſe of, to intimate this to us, by *Cebes* in his Table, where we find theſe words: Ὁρᾷς ἢ θύραν τινὰ μικρὰν καὶ οὐδὲν πρὸ αὐτῆς ἢ θύρας, ὅπου ὁ πολὺ ἔχλειται, ἀλλὰ πάνυ ὀλίγοι πορεύονται ὥσπερ δυσιόδου τινὸς καὶ τραχείας καὶ πετρώδους εἶναι δοκούσης; *Do you ſee alſo a certain little gate, and a path before that gate which is not much frequented, but trodden only by a very few, as ſeeming to be unpaſſable, rugged, and uneven?* And he that was aſked, making anſwer, that he did ſee it; ἄνω τινὰ ἰέναι ὁ οὐδείς, ἔφη, ὁ ἄγων τῆς τῷ ἀληθινῷ παιδείᾳ: *This*, he ſaid, *was that way that leads to true Learning.* Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 23. *Note* d.] Our Author is here miſtaken; for in all the beſt Greek Writers there is nothing more common than this Phraſe, which is a form of turning the Diſcourſe that was before indirect into a direct one, or of mixing both thoſe ways of ſpeaking together, and it makes the ſenſe to be no other than if all the Sentence was indirectly ſpoken: *I will profeſs to them that I never knew them, and will bid all that work Iniquity to depart from me.* And this way of confounding a direct and indirect Speech together, tho it ſeems I know not how to have ſomething that looks careleſs in it, yet it expreſſes the thing more to the life than any other way would do. There is an inſtance of this in *Theophraſtus*, Charact. cap. iii. de Adulatione: Προσδοκῶν αὐτὸς τὸν αὑτοῦ φίλον, προσδεχόμενόν οἱ πεῖν, ὅτι αὐτὸς οἱ ἔρχεται. καὶ ἀναχάσας, ὅτι προσήγγελκε: *As he was on his way to a certain Friend of his, the* (Flatterer) *overtook him and told him, his* (Friend) *was coming to him; and then returning back, I have given him*, ſays he, *notice beforehand of your coming.* Such Examples as theſe we may, in our reading, every where meet with; which makes the bare ſuggeſting of it here to be ſufficient.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 2. ΚΥΡΙΕ.] *It was the cuſtom of the Jews*, ſays *Grotius*, *to give any one they ſpake to*, this title, *yea tho they did not know the perſon*, Joh. xx. 15. Were it needful, I could bring a multitude of proofs of its having been alſo the cuſtom of the *Romans*. *Seneca* Ep. iii. ſays, *Obvios, ſi nomen non ſuccurrit, dominos ſalutamus. If we meet with any one, and cannot juſt then call to mind his name, we give him the title of Sir, or Lord.* So *Martial* lib. i. Ep. 113.

Cum te non noſſem, dominum, regemque vocabam;
Cum bene te novi, jam mihi Priſcus eris.

Chapter VIII.

I rather think nevertheleſs that there is ſomething more here meant by it, and that the *Leper* gave our *Saviour* this title of אדני *adoni* with a deſign to honour him, tho perhaps ſo great and famous a *Prophet*'s name might not be unknown to him. And ſo the *Romans* uſed alſo to do. *Sueton.* in Claudio cap. xxi. *Hortando, rogandóque ad hilaritatem homines provocabat, dominos identidem appellans. He uſed by careſſes and intreaties to excite people to chearfulneſs, calling them every now and then Lords.* So *Seneca* Epiſt. civ. *Illud mihi in ore erat Domini mei Gallionis. I had in my mouth that* (ſaying) *of my Lord Gallio.* So the *Hebrews* uſe the word אדני See *Gen.* xxxiii. 8. and xliv. where you may meet with this word ſeveral times.

Verſ. 4. *Note* b.] Beſides the reaſons which the learned *Dr. Hammond* has aſſigned of *Chriſt's* unwillingneſs to have it divulged that he was the *Meſſias*, there may be *two* others given of no ſmall importance. The *firſt* is, that *Chriſt* had rather this ſhould be gathered from his works than by his Diſciples or his own publiſhing it, becauſe the *faith* that was hereby begotten in Men would be much the firmer, as having the true grounds of a *ſolid faith* to rely upon. And thus when thoſe that were ſent to him by *John* the *Baptiſt*, deſired of him to be ſatisfied whether he was that perſon *that was to come*, he made anſwer: *Go and tell John the things which ye hear and ſee; The blind receive their ſight*, &c. Matt. xi. 4, 5. The *other* is, becauſe if his Diſciples had openly proclaimed him to be the *Meſſias*, they would have drawn after them a vaſt multitude of People who expected the *Meſſias* under the notion of a *temporal King*, and were exceeding deſirous of innovations; which ſort of Men were more fit to raiſe a ſedition than to advance the Kingdom of Heaven by juſt and proper Methods. To prevent therefore the reſorting of evil men to him with a deſign to innovate, and ſo making a wrong uſe of his Name and Authority, he thought it better, till that danger was over, to have the publiſhing of the truth deferred. Thus *Joh.* vi. 15. we ſee, the multitude after they had been fed by him, fell into ſuch a ſort of conſultation; whereupon *when he knew that they would come and take him by force, to make him a King, he departed alone by himſelf into a mountain.* It was an extraordinary piece of Wiſdom in *Chriſt*, to take care there might be no ſedition laid either to his or his Diſciples charge, whilſt the Goſpel was but begun to be preached; for if ſuch a thing could have been done with any appearance of juſtice, every body eaſily perceives that it would have been a mighty prejudice to the Chriſtian Religion.

Verſ. 10. *Note* f.] Since our Author in his Notes upon this place has thought fit to put together all that he had obſerved concerning the

the different notions of the word πίστις, I will contribute also my share. Chapter
Πίστις has several significations amongst the *Greeks* that have nothing to VIII.
do here; but this is to be taken notice of, *viz.* that tho *trust* be the
first notion of that word, and its *secondary* signification is that *credit* or
assent which we give to one who affirms things that we never saw, nor
have any mathematical demonstration of; yet because among things
of that kind, there are some asserted by all Nations that relate to divine
matters, and which in points of faith challenge the first place, altho
we neither see them, nor have any mathematical evidence for them,
therefore πίστις signifies καθ' ὑπεροχὴν or *by way of eminence* a persuasion
about matters of *Religion*. So *Ælian* Var. Histor. lib. ii. c. 31. having
said that there was no Atheist to be found amongst the *Barbarians*, but
only among the *Greeks*; and that the *Barbarians* believed that there
were *Gods* who took care of human affairs, and foretold things to come,
adds: ὑπὲρ τούτων ἰσχυρὰν ἔχοντες τὴν πίστιν, θύουσί τε καθαρῶς καὶ ἁγνεύουσιν ἐσίως, καὶ
τὰ ἱερά: *having a firm persuasion of these things, they offer up sacrifices in a
pure manner, and keep themselves chast and holy, &c.*

When the *Jews* began to write Greek, they used the word πίστις in the
same sense; for the *credit* yielded to their sacred Writings, and those
that believed them, they called πιστὸς and πεπίστευται. So the *Son of Sirach*,
Chap. i. 25. Ἡ δίδυμα αὐτῆ πίστις καὶ πραότης: *the things that please him*
(*i. e.* God) *are faith and meekness:* and Ch. xlv. 6. ἐν πίστει καὶ πραότητι
ἡγίασεν αὐτὸν: *he sanctified him by faith and meekness.* So 1 Macc. iii. 13.
ἐκκλησία πιστῶν signifies a body of *Jews*. But the Christians that follow-
ed the Jews in their way of speaking, gave the name of πίστις to the
Persuasion of those that believed in Christ, and opposed it to a
twofold kind of ἀπιστία *Unbelief*, one of which was proper to the Hea-
thens, and the other to the Jews, who notwithstanding they credi-
ted the Old Testament, yet refused to believe Christ and his Apo-
stles. However, in all these instances πίστις signifies a *persuasion*, of
those things particularly which the Discourse relates to; and as
those are various, so we may, if we please, make *Faith* to be of se-
veral kinds. But because no one can believe the Authority of any
Laws, but he must also observe them, provided he does not dis-
agree with himself; therefore no body could seriously and heartily
believe that *Christ* was sent down from Heaven to men, to teach
them the way of eternal Salvation, without obeying *Christ*'s Precepts:
just as no body believed the Law of *Moses* to be the only Rule of Life
revealed by *God*, who did not, in part at least, conform themselves
thereto. And hence this word πίστις came, in the Writings of the
Apostles, to signify not only a persuasion of the truth of the Chri-
stian

Chapter VIII.

stian Doctrin, but also a disposition of Mind, and Practice agreeable to it, the necessary effect of believing.

But it must be observed, that in different places of the New Testament, in proportion to the Subject treated of, this word has a larger or more contracted Notion. 1. Where the Discourse is about the *Faith* of the *Patriarchs*, we are to understand by it such a perswasion of the truth of those things they received as divine Revelations as was accompanied with an answerable temper of Mind and Life. In which sense it occurs frequently in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. xi. and elsewhere. 2. Where *Christ*'s discourse is of those that believed in him as transacting upon earth, as he does here in S. *Matthew*, and up and down every where in the Gospels, by Faith is meant a perswasion of his having been truly sent of *God*, with a power of doing Miracles, and of the truth of all his Doctrine as far as it was known. 3. But after the Apostles had received the *Holy Ghost*, and expounded the whole Christian Doctrine more at large, the notion of *Faith* included in it a perswasion not only of the truth of *Christ*'s Mission, but also of his *Apostles* and *Disciples*, whose Doctrine *God* gave a testimony to by innumerable wonders; and an assent accordingly yielded to whatever they asserted, joined with a Life sutable to such a perswasion. And this notion the word πίστις has in the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, where St. *Paul* disputes about *Justification*. For in these places πίστις, *i. e.* a living according to the Christian Institution, setting aside the works commanded by the Law of *Moses* only, is said to *justify*, i. e. to procure mens being esteemed *just*, or good and pious by *God*, and being acceptable to him. And on the other hand, the Apostle denies that *Works*, viz. those which were *opposed* by the *Jews* to Faith, or the Christian Religion, did either under the Gospel, or ever of old, justify. And this he makes good by several Arguments, which shall in their proper places be explained. It shall suffice at present to have run over the different senses that the word πίστις is capable of, and pointed to its original Signification.

But there is this further to be added, that as *Faith* includes more than a *bare perswasion* about the truth of a thing in the mind; so this *perswasion* it self must be such a one, as is the result of having seriously weighed and examined the Arguments by which the truth of the Christian Doctrine is confirmed. For it is not to be imagined that the *Centurion*, for instance, did believe in *Christ*, hand over head, without reason or due consideration: He had, without doubt, seen some of his other Miracles, and heard his Doctrine, and had been made to believe that there was nothing too difficult for *Christ*, who had

had all power given him by *God*, to do. This his Diſcourſe manifeſtly ſhews. But he could never have examined *Chriſt*'s Doctrine and Miracles, as it was requiſite he ſhould, unleſs he had been freed from two of the mightieſt Impediments to it, whereof one is Obſtinacy, whereby we become impenetrable to all reaſons, be they never ſo ſtrong; and the other, a wicked Life, which makes Men unwilling to believe thoſe things, the acknowledgment whereof would render it neceſſary for them to live otherwiſe than they did before. And therefore it is, that Faith has ſuch a commendation beſtowed upon it; which matter I have diſcourſed upon in my Notes upon *Gen.* xv. 6. and have there quoted out of *Philo* a very remarkable paſſage in which Faith is commended. Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 11. *Note* h.] It is no wonder, (when men are neither able to diſcourſe themſelves, nor to underſtand what Beings of a different nature ſay about the Concernments of another Life, but in Metaphors taken from the things of this) that the future Happineſs is deſcribed in this place by the ſimilitude of a Feaſt. But yet I believe that *Chriſt* was not the firſt inventor of this ſimilitude, but borrowed it from the *Jews* of that time, amongſt whom it was in daily uſe, and who alſo were beholden for it, as they were for many other things, to the *Greeks*. The Poets of that Nation in order to repreſent *Ixion* as a moſt happy King, feigned him to have been *entertained at a Feaſt by the Gods*. The ſame they ſaid of *Tantalus*, who, to uſe the words of *Pindar* in *Olympion*, Od. 1. καταπέλαι μέγαν ὄλβον ὐκ ἐλπόμενον, *could not digeſt that great felicity*. Hence that of *Empedocles* about the eternal Fellowſhip and Converſation of the Juſt with one another:

Ἀθανάτοις ἄλλοισιν ὁμίσσοι, ἵν' τι τερπίζοισι
Εὐνῆς, ἀνδρείων ἀχέων ἀπίκοοι, ἄτειροι.

Companions with the reſt of the immortal ſociety, making themſelves merry with feaſting, free from thoſe pains to which mortals are ſubject, and never weary. And *Epictetus* following his example, in *Enchirid.* c. xxi. beſpeaks in this manner one that had made a great proficiency in Wiſdom: ἴσθι ποτὲ ἐν θεῶν ἄξιος συμπότης; *you will be a worthy gueſt, another day, for the Gods.*

Verſ. 12. Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.] For the underſtanding of this, we muſt reflect upon the ſimilitude of a Supper here made uſe of. Now the time of ſupping was after the Sun was ſet, and the night came to be almoſt at the darkeſt. And therefore thoſe that were thruſt out of the place where the Supper was made, and the Room full of lights, are, in agreement with the other part of the ſimilitude, ſaid to be caſt

Chapter IX. caſt into *outward darkneſs*. See alſo *Ch.* xxii. 13. This is the original of this form of Speech, and the meaning of it is eaſy to be underſtood: for as that which is ſignified by being a Gueſt at the Supper is *Happineſs*; ſo to be put out of the place where the Supper was made, into the ſtreet, ſignifies the *loſing or falling ſhort of it*.

Ibid. *Note* g.] What authority the Doctor had for ſaying that κλαίειν ſignifies *to cry out*, I cannot tell; but tho that word may denote *wailing* or *lamenting* as well as ſilently weeping, yet it does not follow that it may be rendered by *crying out*, the word that he makes uſe of. Conſult the *Lexicographers*.

Verſ. 22. *Note* k.] To what *Grotius* has ſaid, according to the Opinion of *Philoſophers*, about the various kinds of Death, add the Collections of *John Pricæus* upon the ſame ſubject, on 1 *Tim.* v. 5. Thoſe words, *If ye walk contrary*, &c. are in *Lev.* xxvi. 21, 24. and there is no ἀντικόλλαπτ in them. See my Notes on the place.

Verſ. 28. *Note* l.] Our Author here ſeems to be of the Opinion of the *Platoniſts*, who thought the Devils uſed to rove about mens Sepulchres. *Synecius*, who every body knows ſpeaks conſtantly like a *Platoniſt*, gives them upon that account the Title of Τυμβοκόμοι, Hym. iv. v. 47.

Οἱ δ' ἐμπόδιοι	*But now let the interrupters*
Ἁγίων ὕμνων,	*Of ſacred hymns,*
Κευθμωνοχαρεῖς,	*That delight in lurking holes,*
Καὶ τυμβοκόμοι,	*And beſet tombs,*
Δαίμονες ὕδη	*The Devils,*
Φευγάτωσαν ἐμᾶν	*Be gone from my*
Ὁσίαν δ' ἀχάν.	*Holy prayer.*

But I do very much doubt whether any ſuch thing as this can be concluded from this paſſage in the Evangeliſt; for it was very poſſible that the Devils might drive two men to the tombs, and yet thoſe evil Spirits not make their uſual abode in thoſe places.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 14. *Note* d. I Queſtion very much whether the *Doctor* rightly interprets the places he had occaſion to quote in his Annotations upon this Verſe. They will all very well admit of a different Explication. I. That Queſtion, *Why do we and the Phariſees faſt often, and thy Diſciples faſt not?* may be conſtrued as if the Diſciples of *John* had ſaid, *Since we and the Phariſees often faſt,* why

why do not thy Disciples also fast? or, *Why do not they fast as we do?* It was not the design of *John*'s Disciples to enquire *simply* why the Disciples of *Christ* did not fast, but why they did not follow the example of all devout men among the *Jews*, who used to fast often. II. *God*'s meaning in *Exod.* xx. is this: "After thou hast labour'd six days, "thou shalt make the seventh a day of rest. Had *God* spoken any otherwise than he did, it could hardly have been known which that seventh day was which he would have to be kept as a day of rest; for it might have been the seventh day of every month, or of every year. III. That place in St. *Mark*, Chap. x. is nothing at all to the purpose: *Whosoever*, says Christ, *shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.* Where Christ does not respect what might be done in pursuance of the *Law*, but the *practice* of the *Gentiles*, who allowed Women this power. We are sure that *Salome*, *Herod*'s Sister, followed this example, and there were perhaps some others that would have been ready enough to have done the like. IV. St. *Paul*'s meaning in *Ephes.* iv. is really, that Anger is not unlawful if it be but kept within bounds. V. The place cited out of St. *James* serves not in the least the *Doctor*'s design. For the comforting of the rich upon the loss of their riches, is not the only thing that the *Apostle* there intends. See the Notes upon that place. VI. The form of speech used by St. *Paul* Rom. vi. 12. *But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, into which ye were delivered*, is almost like that of the Disciples of *John*. But *that ye were* ὅτι ἦτε signifies either, *that ye are no longer the servants*, &c. or, *that tho ye were the servants of sin, nevertheless ye have obeyed.* Chapter IX.

But notwithstanding all this, Dr. *Hammond*'s Observation is true, if it be accommodated to other places. There are, for instance, several things said in *Parables* which do not concern the scope of them, but are only for ornament sake, and to make the Hearers the more attentive; tho it seems to have no manner of ground in the places by him alledged. But it is common for those that have not from their very youth made it their business carefully to study the Criticks, to find difficulties in the plainest things. And Dr. *Hammond* is far from being the only instance of this.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 2. *Note* b. Πέτρος and Πίτρος are certainly uſed indifferently; but thoſe that ſpake Greek preferred the uſe of the *former* becauſe they thought a word of the *maſculine* Gender more proper for the *Sirname* of a Man than one of the *feminine*. But of this name here given to *Simon* there will be a fitter occaſion to ſpeak when we come to the xvi. Chapter.

Verſ. 9. *Note* e.] Our learned *Author* in this Annotation is miſtaken, I. in that he denies the words ſpoken by *Jacob* of himſelf *Gen.* xxxii. to be declarative of his poverty; for all the meaning of that *Patriarch* is, that when he croſſed over *Jordan*, in his way to *Meſopotamia*, he was *poor*, and that afterwards he returned back from thence *rich*. See the place, and my Notes upon it. Tho it would be but ill inferred from thence that he went thither in the habit of a beggar. II. *Homer* does certainly deſcribe *Uliſſes* at his return in the quality of a beggar. See *Odyſſ.* P. verſe 197. *&* *ſeqq.* where *Uliſſes* is repreſented as carrying *a filthy purſe full of holes in a great many places*, and *Eumæus* is ſaid to have led him into the City,

Πτωχῷ λιγαλίῳ ἐναλίγκιον, ἠΰ γέροντι, Σκηπτόμενον,

Like a dirty beggar, and an old man, leaning upon a ſtaff. It was a long while ſince the *Doctor* had read *Homer*, when he was writing this. III. I think we ought to take quite another method to reconcile the *Evangeliſts*, of which I ſhall ſpeak, when I come to the parallel in St. *Mark*.

Verſ. 16. *Note* f.] Our ingenious Author, to illuſtrate the general propoſition he lays down by examples, plainly miſapplies moſt of the paſſages here alledged by him. For excepting one place out of *Matt.* xxiii. 16. all the reſt are either precepts or admonitions, as thoſe who will but examin them will eaſily ſee. I ſhall inſtance but in two. *Behold*, ſays Chriſt, *I ſend you forth as ſheep in the midſt of wolves; be ye therefore wiſe as ſerpents, and ſimple as doves.* Theſe words contain a plain precept, and that a very neceſſary one, as well as one that is agreeable to *Chriſt*'s Doctrine. For the Apoſtles being not ſent to men that were lovers of Truth and Juſtice, but to ſuch Perſons as were more like Beaſts than reaſonable creatures, there was a neceſſity of their uſing prudence, leſt going to addreſs themſelves to Men who were wicked to a degree of madneſs, their pains ſhould not only prove ineffectual and to no purpoſe, but they themſelves alſo be oppreſſed by them. And this

this *Chriſt* commands *Matt.* vii. 6. *Give not that which is holy unto Dogs*, &c. But they were at the ſame time to take heed that that prudence of theirs did not turn to craftineſs or deceit, as it would have done, if they had either privately renounced the Goſpel which they had publickly preached, or feigned themſelves inclined to the wicked opinions of the Phariſees. They were not to ſay every thing in all places and in all companies, but they were to ſay nothing that was in the leaſt repugnant to the Doctrines which they had received from their Maſter, or that might hinder the Goſpel's propagation. That which *Chriſt* therefore enjoyns his *Apoſtles*, is, to mix prudence and a ſincere plainneſs together. Of which vertues he himſelf was a moſt perfect pattern, who never expoſed himſelf to the fury of the Jews but when there was a neceſſity for it. But St. *Peter* offended againſt this precept by acting the part of a Diſſembler, of which we have an account given us by St. *Paul*, Gal. ii. 12. making uſe of prudence to an extreme, he forfeited the commendation of being ſincere and upright. Chapter X.

The following words, *Beware of men for they will deliver you*, &c. are a prohibition of *Chriſt* to his Apoſtles not to publiſh immediately to every one the inſtructions they had received from him, for fear they ſhould be dragged to the Synagogues upon the very firſt beginning of their miniſtry. A thing which he himſelf alſo practiſed, delivering his mind in parables, that he might not give too great an occaſion for the paſſions of ill minded men to exert themſelves, and ſaying nothing which he thought would not at preſent be endured by the Perſons he ſpake to. But this was to be no hindrance, as it really was not to the Apoſtles, from expoſing themſelves to ſuch dangers as they could not avoid but by a culpable diſſembling. Theſe things are too manifeſt to need any longer inſiſting upon.

Verſ. 16. *Note* g.] The word ἀκέραιος being immediately ſubjoined to φρόνιμος, it cannot ſignify *one that does not hurt*, but one who together with his *prudence* does not uſe any cunning or ſhifting, but is fair and upright. In this ſenſe we find it uſed by S. *Paul* Rom. xvi. 19. *But yet I would have you wiſe unto that which is good, and ſimple concerning evil*, i. e. far from being cunning to do evil. So in the *Addit.* to *Eſther*, Chap. vi. 4 crafty men are ſaid διαλογίσασθαι τὸν τῆς ἁπλότητος ἀκέραιον διγνωμοσύνῃ, *to have deceived the ſimple honeſty of Rulers.* Accordingly ἀκεραιότης ſignifies ſuch a ſort of temper, in the ſame manner that ἁπλότης ſignifies *ingenuity* or *ſincerity*; to wit, when things are ſimple, and not corrupted by any art or deceit: whence this word ἁπλοῦς came to denote a perſon who had not the leaſt guile to be found in him. And ſo in the ſame manner, ἀκέραιος

Chapter X. or ἀπὸ κρίσεως, is used not only for *pure*, as οἶνος ἀκίρατος *pure wine*, but also for a man that is free from craft or deceit.

The Etymology which *Eustathius* gives of the word from κεκρίζειν is harsh, and will not do in this place. And therefore the *Author* of the *Etymologicon magnum* supplies us with another, which is from κρῶ, i. e. μίγνυμι, κερῶ, *to mingle*, instead of which κεράννυμι is the word in use; from whence ἀκίρατος came to signify primarily *pure*, and secondarily also one that is not corrupted with any dishonesty. And therefore the old Greek and Latin Copy, which contains rather a sort of Paraphrase than (as is generally but erroneously supposed) the bare words of the Evangelists, uses here the word ἁπλούστατα, *most simple*. And thus also *Hesychius* renders Ἀκίραιον by ἀνεπίπλεκτον, καθαρὸν, ἄδολον, *unblameable, pure, without deceit*.

I know that ἀκίρατος signifies likewise *unhurt*; but there is no room here for that signification. It would be nearer the sense, if we took it in the notion that it occurs several times in *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, for one that is free from making a party either with the Grandees or the common People, and meddles with none of their designs. But neither does this notion of the word suite this place. There is nothing can be objected against the interpretation I have given of it, except that *Doves* may be said indeed to be *harmless*, but not properly *sincere*. But we must not be too critical about such things as these; for otherwise we might say in the same manner, that a *prudent* Nature is not so aptly represented by *Serpents* as one that is *treacherous* and *hurtful*. These are proverbial Sayings, which must not be over narrowly searched into; but we must gather their sense very often from Custom rather than the consideration of the things themselves. And of this kind of Sayings we may meet with an infinite number in common Speech.

Vers. 27. *Note* k.] Hither perhaps may be aptly referr'd that Passage in *Herodotus*, lib. 3. cap. 24. where it is said that the *Magi* or learned *Philosophers* of the Country, who had seized upon the Persian Empire, would have obliged *Prexaspes*, by whom *Smerdis* the Son of *Cyrus* had been killed, to proclaim from a high Tower to the *Persians* in a full Assembly, that *Smerdis* was in the Throne. Φάσκοντες Πέρσας πάντας συγκαλέσαι ὑπὸ τὸ βασιλήιον τεῖχος, ἐκέλευον ἀναβάντα δεῦρο πρῆγμα ἀγορεῦσαι ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κύρου Σμέρδι δουλεύουσι: *Saying that they would gather together all the* Persians *under the wall of the palace, they commanded him to go up upon a Tower, and proclaim to them that they were governed by* Smerdis *the Son of* Cyrus.

Vers. 29. *Note* l.] *Tiberius*'s *Assarium* (which is that here spoken of) is said by Doctor *Edward Bernard*, lib. 2. *concerning weights and measures*,

measures, sect. 2. to have been equivalent to six English grains of Silver. Chapter XI.

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 11. Μείζων Ἰωάννου, &c.] It would seem very strange that *our Author*, in his Paraphrase upon this Verse, should deny *John* to have been a *Prophet*, to whom at the 9*th* Verse, and often elsewhere, he gives that Title, were it not plain that either he had no manner of desire to express himself clearly; or else if he had, that how great soever his other excellencies were, Perspicuity was not his Talent. When therefore he denies *John* to have been a *Prophet*, he must mean that, compared with the *Apostles*, he was to be look'd upon rather as a *Disciple* than a *Master*, as he shews in his Note upon the 9*th* Verse.

Vers. 19. Τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.] Of what ill repute the Τελῶναι were among the *Greeks*, our Author informs us in his Notes upon Chap. ix. 10. But there were two sorts of Men at that time in the *Roman* Empire, that might be called Τελῶναι. There were some *Roman* Knights, Men of Honour and Credit, who were *Publicans*, and farm'd the Customs, and are often mention'd with Honour by *Cicero*, especially in his Orations *pro lege Manilia* and *pro Plancio*. This sort of *Publicans* do not seem to be referred to in the Gospels; and that S. *Matthew*, who is call'd Τελώνης, was not of this sort, is beyond all doubt: but then those *Roman* Gentlemen did not gather the Customs themselves, but by their Servants, or Freed-men, or by other men of a low rank. And these also were called Τελῶναι, and were infamous persons, because many times they levied the Taxes and Duties by force, and, as is common in those cases, exacted more than was due. See *Suidas* upon this word. Upon this account it was that they had an ill name, and especially among the *Jews*, who paid Tribute to the *Romans* very much against the grain, and could not, without indignation, see their *Countrymen* employed by the *Romans* to gather it for them. These sort would in Latin be better called *Portitores*, if we should trust the old Latin and Greek *Glossary*, in which *Portitor* is put to answer τελώνης, and *Portitorium* τελωνεῖον. But in that wherein the Greek stands before the Latin, τελώνης is render'd by *Publicanus*, *Vectigalium conductor*.

Vers. 23. *Note* i.] I have some things to observe upon this last Note of the *Doctor*'s, which may serve partly to confute, and partly to confirm what he says.

I. It

Chapter XI.

I. It is true indeed, that the word ἅιδης did not, as we ſhall preſently ſee, immediately and properly ſignify among the *Gentiles* any place; but it is a miſtake that it was put to denote the *State of the dead*, if we take the word in its proper ſignification. It is the name of a *Deity*, who was believed to be chief Ruler in *Hell*, and was otherwiſe ſtiled Πλούτων, *Pluto*, which every child knows. And hence the place where the Souls of the dead were thought to be, was uſually called Ἅιδου δόμος, *the houſe of* Hades. As in *Homer* Odyſſ. κ. 512.

Αὐτὰρ σὺ εἰς ἄϊδος ἴθι καὶ δόμον Ἀϊδωνῆος

But do you go into Pluto's *dark houſe:*

and up and down elſewhere. And εἰς ἅϊδος was uſed as a contraction of the ſame Phraſe, as εἰς ἅϊδος κατελθεῖν, *to go down into* (ſub. the houſe) *of Hades*. Nevertheleſs, afterwards this word was taken for the place over which *Pluto* was thought to reign, as *Iliad.* Θ. v. 16. where Τάρταρος is ſaid to be

Τόσσον ἐνερθ' ἄϊδος, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης,

as much lower than Hades, *as heaven is diſtant from the earth.* The like Examples we may every where meet with. That this place was ſuppoſed to be under ground, no body needs to be told. This is the conſtant acceptation of the word Ἅιδης amongſt the Greeks; it is either *Pluto* himſelf, or his *Kingdom* that is ſignified by it, but never *the State of the dead.*

II. But Dr. *Hammond* produces a place out of *Phurnutus* or *Cornutus*, where he interprets it by ἀφανισμός: but not to ſay that no ſort of Writers can be imagined more impertinent than allegorical Interpreters of Fables, that *Triflemonger* never intended to ſhew what was the common ſignification of the word Ἅιδης, or what *Idea* thoſe had in their minds who heard that word pronounced; but what ſenſe might be put upon it, that thoſe nauſeous Fables might be found to have a meaning in them not perfectly abſurd. But the ſignification of a word muſt be drawn from the ſenſe that it is *vulgarly* taken in, and not from an *allegorical* Interpretation of it, which is generally unknown, and for the moſt part ridiculous. We muſt enquire what notion ſuch a word uſed to excite in the minds of thoſe that heard it, not what ſignification ſome doting Stoick that thinks every thing to be intended in Fables that his own idle fancy ſuggeſts to him, affixed to it.

III. But it will be ſaid that the Etymology of the word is on *Phurnutus* and Dr. *Hammond*'s ſide. And I acknowledg it is ſo, if that be

be the true Etymology of it, which may with reaſon be doubted, be- Chapter
cauſe the word whoſe *original* we are inquiring into, is almoſt every XI.
where written with a *Spiritus aſper* which is not uſual in words compounded with α *Privative*. I confeſs that Ἅιδης is alſo written with a *Spiritus lenis*; but this not being conſtant, it is probable that the former is the true pronunciation of the word, and that the manner of writing it was varied for no other reaſon than becauſe the Greeks afterwards thought *that* to be the true Etymology of the word which Dr. *Hammond* gives us. So the Author of the *Etymologicon magnum* ſays, "Ἅιδης, χωρὶς ἀφῆσις, σιώτως αἰωνίου καὶ ζόφου πανλήρωμένου. ἀπὸ τὸ εἶδω, τὸ βλέπω, εἴδης καὶ μετὰ τῦ στερητικῦ Α, ἀειδὴς, ἐν ᾧ οὐδὲν βλέπομεν, ᾅδης γὰρ ἐστι τὸ σκοτεινὸν οἰκία. But with all the *Greek Grammarians* leave, I ſhould ſay that this is not the true Etymology of the word; but that it muſt be deduced from the Hebrew אִיד which may be pronounced not only as the Authors of the *Maſora* do, *ed*, but *ajid*. The *Phœnicians* perhaps wrote it הִיד, as it is common for the *guttural* Letters to be confounded in the *Oriental Languages*, and as the *Arabians* at this day write it: and ſo from הִיד *Hajid* came *baïdes* and *hades*; and that word, as it is very well known, ſignifies *deſtruction*. There are a great many words that the *Greeks* have in vain attempted to find the original of in their Language, and which have with good ſucceſs been derived by learned men from the *Phœnicians*. I could ſhew why the youngeſt of *Saturn*'s Sons was ſo called, and aſſign the reaſon of the Names of the reſt of them out of the ſame Language: but this is not a proper place for it.

IV. I cannot ſee the reaſon why our learned *Author* citing *Eſth.* xii. 7. will not allow the Heathen King *Artaxerxes* (a Decree of whoſe is in that Chapter recited) to have had any thoughts of *Hell*, or a place of puniſhments. *That heathen King*, ſays he, *cannot be thought to dream of Hell*. For who does not know that the *Heathens* believed there was a place under the earth, in which bad men were puniſhed? 'Tis plain the *Greeks* did, and I need not prove the *Perſians* to have been of the ſame opinion; for he that wrote the Additions to *Eſther*, was not ſo well skill'd in the ſentiments of the *Perſians*, but that he might confound them with thoſe of the *Greeks*. Or however there is nothing that ſhould oblige us to think, that as to this matter, the opinion of the *Greeks* and *Perſians* was not the very ſame. Beſides, εἰς Ἅιδην is not as much as to ſay in Engliſh *to Hell*, or in French *en enfer*; for theſe words do only ſignify the place of *puniſhments*, whereas the *Greek* are more comprehenſive, and take in not only *Hell* or the place of *Torments*, but likewiſe the *Elyſian fields*.

V.

Chapter XI.

V. One queſtion there is behind that is not eaſy to be reſolved, *viz.* what notion the *Jews* who uſed the Greek Tongue, affixed to that word Ἅδης: I will not heap together all that might be ſaid with relation to this matter; Two things only I ſhall obſerve, that may help us to find out the meaning of *Chriſt*'s words. 1. That the *Jews* had a word in their Language which ſignified a *grave*, any *ſubterraneous* places, and *the State of the dead*; and that was שאל *Scheol*, which I have treated of on *Gen.* xxxvii. 35. and which upon all accounts it ſeems likely that *Chriſt* here made uſe of. The *Syriack*, I am ſure, has שיולא. Now when this word is oppoſed to *Heaven*, it ſignifies, among the Hebrews, *the loweſt places of the earth*; and where *Heaven* is by a metaphor taken for *Glory* and *Proſperity*, שאל denotes *obſcurity* and *adverſity*. Thus *Iſai.* xiv. 11, 12. it is ſaid in this ſenſe of the King of Babylon: *thy pride is brought down* שאל ——— *how art thou fallen from Heaven!* &c. And juſt in this manner *Chriſt* here ſpeaks to *Capernaum*, and uſes the word שאל in the ſame ſenſe with *Iſaiah*, for a miſerable and low condition; as he had before uſed the word *Heaven*, to expreſs the happy State of that City whilſt he preached and wrought Miracles in it. 2. Amongſt the reſt of the ſenſes attributed to the word ἅδης by the *Jews* who ſpake the Greek Language, all which I ſhall not enumerate, there was that which I ſaid belonged to the *Hebrew* word, inſtead of which they generally uſed this. Which appears clearly from hence, that καταπατω τῆς γῆς and ἅδης were in their ſpeech *ſynonimous*. Thus whereas it is ſaid by St. *Peter*, that it was impoſſible for *Chriſt* to be left εἰς ἅδην, *Act.* ii. 27. St. *Paul* ſays that he deſcended εἰς καταπατερα μέρη τῆς γῆς, *Eph.* iv. 9. And in this ſenſe St. *Matthew* or his Interpreter, in the room of the word שאל which *Chriſt* made uſe of, has uſed the Greek ἅδης. If this be true, as it is likely, almoſt all that *our Author* ſays upon this place muſt of neceſſity fall to the ground. To the other places of the New Teſtament, where this word is found, I ſhall ſay ſomething when I come to them.

Verſ. 27. Οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν, &c.] This *Verſe* muſt be joined to the 25, that *Chriſt* may be underſtood to declare to the *Jews*, as well as *Gentiles*, that notwithſtanding their profeſſed eagerneſs after divine knowledg, the true Worſhip of God his Father, and the offices of the *Meſſias*, were things that they were ſtrangers to. For the Jews imagined that the obſervation of the letter of the Law rendered them acceptable to God, whilſt they neglected the purpoſe of the Lawgiver; which was to make them truly vertuous, in the manner that Chriſt alone has taught us to be. And they expected alſo the *Meſſias* to

to come in the quality of an earthly Prince, and free them from that extream bondage which they were under to the *Romans*. So that they neither knew the *Father* nor the *Son*. Chapter XI.

Verſ. 28. Κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι] We are to underſtand this only of the *Jews*, who ἐκοπίων were tired, by reaſon of the frequent journies that the Law obliged them to make to *Jeruſalem*, and which they took for fear of offending *God*, tho not without a great deal of trouble. The deſign of *Chriſt* is to inſinuate to the *Jews*, without ſpeaking his mind in plain terms, which would have been unſeaſonable at that time, that he was about to teach his Diſciples a way how they might worſhip *God* acceptably without that bodily labour. This he teaches the Samaritan woman more clearly *Joh.* iv. 21. to whom he might declare a thing which the *Jews* were utterly averſe to without any preſent danger. The πεφορτισμένοι are perſons burden'd with Legal rites, and all thoſe things which they were to pay to *God*, the *Prieſts* and *Levites*, which were much more inculcated on them, than charity or any other vertue. And therefore theſe things are afterwards, chap. xxiii. 4. called φορτία. See alſo *Luc.* xi. 46. Thoſe who underſtand *Chriſt* to ſpeak here of vices, beſides deſtroying their connexion with what goes before, offer violence to the very words; for ſuch as ſerve their vices, are not *weary* or *heavy laden*, which are words that denote perſons under *trouble* or *diſquiet*, but they indulge their wicked inclinations with *delight*, and are hardly brought to renounce them. Thoſe men do not think themſelves to want any ἀναπαυσις, for they acquieſce in their vices with abundance of pleaſure. But the Jews groaned under a yoke of Ceremonies, which they were unable to bear, as St. *Peter* declares *Act.* xv. 10. and had need of reſt, which under the Law it was impoſſible for them to enjoy, becauſe they were forced to make a journey, thrice a year at leaſt, to *Jeruſalem*.

Verſ. 29. Πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς.] The Doctors of the Law, eſpecially thoſe of the Sacerdotal race, were neither meek nor lowly, being cruel exactors of thoſe burdenſom things that were commanded in the Law, and proud of having the common People of the *Jews* tributary to them. But there is nothing of this nature in *Chriſt*, who requires only a good Life, and condeſcends to the very meaneſt, whoever they be. How extreamly haughty and diſdainful the *Prieſts* in thoſe times were, *Joſephus* informs us, Lib. xx. c. 6. *Antiq. Jud.*

Verſ. 30. *Note* 1.] χρηστὸς, when ſpoken of *a perſon*, ſignifies *good*, *bountiful*, *courteous*, or *merciful*; but when it is a thing that is ſpoken of, as it is here, then it ſignifies the ſame with χρήσιμος *profitable*, which comes from the ſame Primitive, or elſe ſomething like it, according as

Chapter XI. the nature of the thing is. *Jerem.* xxiv. 3, 5. *good figs* are called σῦκα χρηστὰ by the *Septuagint*; and *Ezek.* xxviii. 13. *a precious stone*, λίθος χρηστός. *Æschylus*, in *Aristophanes*, Ran. Act. iv. Sc. 2. says to *Euripides*: Πάντ' ἂν λέγων χρηστὰ λέγων ἀνὴρ εἶ: *We must by all means speak useful things.* Whence in following Ages, any collections of useful things were called χρηστομαθίαι, and the sentences mark'd in the margin of the Books with the letter X, which needs no proof. So in *Hesych.* χρηστὸς (for so it is to be read and not χρήστης) is interpreted by χρήσιμος, and χρηστὸν by χρησίμων. If this were not a thing past doubt, I would add the words of *Suidas* and *Phavorinus*; but I must not take up my own or the Readers time. Ζυγὸς χρηστὸς therefore signifies *a profitable yoke*, which is for the benefit or advantage of those that bear it; which the *Mosaical* was not, but as it is opposed to the Gospel yoke, was of *it self* unprofitable. For of what use were so many sacrifices, so many taxes, under the name of First-fruits and Tithes, taking so many journeys, and so many Purifications, if we consider them in themselves? All that they served for was only to consume that wealth which was gotten with a great deal of pains, and to render Life more troublesome. For these things did not of themselves make men good or acceptable to *God*. And therefore they were not χρηστὰ, or, to speak in the words of *Ezekiel* c. xx. 25. they were *precepts that were not good*. But the yoke of *Christ* is useful to him that takes it upon him, many times in this Life, and always in that which is to come. It makes men good, and well pleasing to *God*, and confers eternal happiness upon them.

Ibid. Ἐλαφρὸν] This is opposed to the ἀνεξέταστα φορτία of the *Doctors of the Law*, which neither the antient *Jews* nor the men of that Age were able to bear. This was a most heavy burden even to good men, who were desirous to observe every thing which the Law commanded, and yet could not do it but with a very great deal of pain and difficulty; but on the other hand, nothing is more easy to a good man, than obedience to the *Gospel*, which requires nothing but what all that are good must needs approve. If any man thinks the precepts of the Gospel to be difficult, he is still a bad man; and that may be fitly applied to him,

Nulla est tam facilis res, quin difficilis fiat,
Quam invitus faciat.

It is strange that neither *Grotius* nor the *Doctor* should perceive that these things were spoken in opposition to the *Jewish* rites.

CHAP.

V. 8. middle of *Note* a.

OUR learned Author goes about here to confute *H. Grotius*, who thinks that by the *Son of Man* we muſt underſtand Man in common, and not *Chriſt*. The whole ſtrength of the *Doctor*'s reaſoning is from the *uſe* of that phraſe; for all that he ſays beſides is ſo forced, that the bare comparing of it with what is ſaid by *Grotius* is enough to ſhew how much he is that great man's inferiour in this debate. But however let us examin what he ſays. I. Thoſe words in the 6 Verſe, *one greater than the Temple is here*, are not connected with the following 8 v. *for the Son of Man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath*, but with what goes before; and therefore it is not neceſſary that he *who was greater than the Temple* and *the Son of Man* ſhould be the ſame. II. In *Dan.* vii. 13. *the Son of Man* is taken for *a Man*, and not for the name of the *Meſſias*, whatever was the uſe of that phraſe in *Chriſt*'s time. *I ſaw*, ſays the Prophet, *in the night viſions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like the Son of Man*, כבר אנש, i. e. the appearance of a Man. This is known to be the conſtant uſe of this phraſe in the Old Teſtament; and that *Chriſt* ſhould ſometimes uſe it in the ſame ſignification will not ſeem ſtrange to any, tho at other times he calls *himſelf* the *Son of Man*, or *a Man*. III. The phraſe *for man* in St. *Mark* does certainly ſignify *for the good of Man*; to wit, that Servants might have reſt, which was the principal end of the *Sabbath*; from whence it follows that man is *Lord of the Sabbath*, in this reſpect, that he may either obſerve, or neglect the *Sabbath*, according as affairs, upon which his ſafety depends, require. For otherwiſe, if this had not been lawful, *man had been for the Sabbath* and *not the Sabbath for man*; in as much as it would have been his duty to ſet leſs by his own Life than the obſervation of the *Sabbath*. Thus, if there be a juſt occaſion, we are obliged to lay down our lives, rather than not obſerve thoſe precepts of eternal equity and obligation, that are contained in the Goſpel; becauſe the keeping of thoſe precepts was the end for which *God* created us. And yet *they* too, I acknowledg, may in a ſort be ſaid to be *for us*, becauſe, if they were but univerſally obſerved, they would be a means of making men happy both in this life, and everlaſtingly in the other. But the Sabbatical days of reſt come quite under another conſideration, and were not appointed for the good of the mind, ſo much as of the body. The *Jews*, according to the intention of the Lawgiver, were bound only to obſerve them ſo far as they could without inconvenience, and conſiſtently with ſelf-preſervation. In all other caſes

Chapter XII. they were to have a greater regard to their life than to the keeping of holy days. *Dr. Hammond* therefore has made an ill advantage of the ambiguity of this phraſe *for the good of man*, which does not always ſignify the ſame thing. Add to this that I have ſaid what *Grotius* has upon this place, and then there will be no room to doubt but that this learned Engliſh Gentleman has miſtaken the true deſign of it.

Verſ. 20. *Note* e.] Few that are skilled in the *Hebrew*, will allow our *Author* that לאמת יוציא משפט *he ſhall bring forth judgment unto truth* is the ſame with *he ſhall bring forth a true judgment*; for to expreſs this the *Jews* would ſay יוציא משפט אמת *he ſhall bring forth the judgment of truth.* It is more probable that the *Evangeliſt*, who produces rather the ſenſe than the very words of the Prophecy, expreſſes that which the *Prophet* calls *to bring forth judgment unto truth* by ἐκβάλλειν νεῖκος εἰς νῖκος, and would be underſtood thus, to advance the Doctrine of true Piety ſo as that it ſhall prevail over falſhood; which is the ſame, as to lay down that Doctrine in ſuch a manner as to make it appear true. Undoubtedly that Doctrine which is looked upon as true, muſt be ſaid to have overcome; and this is the only victory that the Goſpel can obtain, to be looked upon as true.

Ibid. *Note* d.] This proverbial expreſſion, *not to break a bruiſed reed, nor to quench ſmoking flax*, is rightly expounded by *Dr. Hammond* as well as by many others before him. I add, that the *Latins* much after the ſame manner uſed the phraſe *extinguere extinctos*, to ſignify the killing or deſtroying outright ſuch as had before but little hope left of ſafety. Thus the Writer to *Heremnius* Lib. 4. 52. after he had told how a City was taken by the Soldiers, brings in a Woman deprecating the Conquerors anger in theſe terms: *Parce, & per ea quæ tibi dulciſſima ſunt in vita, miſerere noſtri; noli extinguere extinctos. We beſeech you, by all that you count ſweeteſt in life, to ſpare and take pity upon us, do not reſolve to deſtroy thoſe that are already deſtroyed.*

Verſ. 24. *Note* f.] What our Author has about the *God Achor*, perhaps he took out of *Selden de Diis Syris*, Synt. 11. c. 6. where this matter is copiouſly handled. Certain it is that Mr. *Selden* wrote firſt. But both of them were deceived by a falſe reading in *Pliny*, whoſe words, in the vulgar editions were corrupted. In the Manuſcript Copy there is no mention made of the *Cyrenæans*, nor of *Achor Deus*, as *Salmaſius* in his *Plinian. exercit.* p. 10. *Edit. Ultraj.* obſerves, who muſt be conſulted by thoſe that have a mind to enquire more throughly into this matter. He thinks, and very rightly, that we may from the marks that are found in the old written copy read the words thus: *invocant —— Elei Myiagron Deum, muſcarum multitudine peſtilentiam afferente;*

afferente; and this reading was taken into the context of the *Paris Edition*, *ann.* 1685. Chapter XII.

It will bear likewiſe a diſpute, whether it be a probable conjecture of our Author, that the *Ekronites God Beelzebub* was the ſame with the *Grecians Jupiter*. For *Jupiter*, a Deity among the Greeks, was as unknown to the *Philiſtines*, as *Dagon* the *God* of the *Philiſtines* was to the *Greeks*. It was a piece of vanity in the poor ſilly *Grecians*, raſhly to think that their Gods were every where worſhipped, as I might eaſily ſhew if it was a thing to be done in this place: But I do not here take upon me to explain the *Greek* Mythology.

Verſ. 27. *Note* g.] The *Doctor* might perhaps have added, that the whole of *Chriſt*'s reaſoning in this place conſiſts of Arguments *ad hominem*; for there are ſeveral things here ſuppoſed as true, becauſe they were believed by the *Jews*, which are no where deſignedly laid down for certain by *Chriſt*, nor any where confirmed by the *Apoſtles*. *One* is, that there is ſuch a political order amongſt the Devils, as that one rules over the reſt in the quality of a *Prince*, and under the name of *Beelzebub*; which every one muſt needs look upon as doubtful. *Another* thing is, that that political order ſhould continue for a great while after that time, and conſequently the Devils ſhould have no civil diſſenſions among themſelves. It's certain that the *Perſians*, who called the *Devil* by the name of *Arimanes*, thought that his Empire would never be at an end till it was overthrown by *Oromazes* or the *good God*. See *Stanley Philoſoph. Oriental.* Lib. ii. c. 6. And much ſuch an opinion as this ſeems to have been taken up by the *Jews*, who perhaps had it from the *Chaldeans*, and, if we believe learned men, the reſt alſo of the Doctrine about the ſeveral orders that there are among the *Angels*. It may be further asked perhaps, why *Chriſt* did not anſwer an objection which eaſily ſprings up in a mans mind upon the reading of this reaſoning of his. For it might have been pretended by the *Phariſees*, that this was only an artifice in the *Prince* of the *Devils* to expel his ſubject *Devils* for a little time, who might afterwards enter in again unobſerved and ſettle him more ſecurely in his Dominion; and ſo that there ſeemed to be a diſſenſion among the *Devils*, tho *really* there was none. But this pretence the Doctrine of *Chriſt* it ſelf ſufficiently confutes; and his Reſurrection, which was purpoſely intended as a confirmation of his Doctrine, put the matter out of all doubt. For how could it be imagined that ſo *holy* a Doctrine, confirm'd by miracles from *Heaven*, ſhould owe its being ſo univerſally ſpread to a previous juggle and contrivance among the *Devils*? This is in effect, tho but obſcurely, ſuggeſted by *Chriſt* at the 33*d* Verſ.

Verſ.

Chapter XII.

Verſ. 32. *Note* h.] It is very true that דבר, which properly ſignifies a *word*, is taken very often for a *thing*; but the phraſe *to ſpeak a word* אמר דבר was never uſed to ſignify *to do* any *thing*. The firſt therefore is very well obſerved by the *Doctor*, and demonſtrated before by examples at chap. xi. ver. 23. of this *Goſpel*. But the latter no body will ever be able to prove. For tho דבר ſignifies both *word* and *thing*, yet it does not follow that *verbs* of a near ſignification, as particularly that the verb אמר *to ſpeak* ſignifies to *do*, nor can any ſuch inſtance be given. It is true alſo, that thoſe who *ſpeak words againſt the Holy Ghoſt* do *oppoſe* him; but the reaſon of that is, becauſe *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh*, and it is impoſſible that a man ſhould ſpeak vilifying words of thoſe Miracles that are wrought by a divine power, but he muſt have a deſign to reſiſt them. So that our Author, which I am ſorry for, has not in the beginning of this laſt Annotation of his, given us any Evidence of his great skill in *Grammar*: What he ſays beſides is extraordinary; and no body, that I know of, has ſo happily explained wherein the Sin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt* conſiſts. This Sin is excellently compared to ſinning under the Law *with a hand lifted up*; which thoſe were guilty of who, after warning given them, put an open contempt upon the Laws authority, and ſpake in reproachful terms concerning it, as we have ſhewn in our Notes on *Numbers*. For juſt as thoſe who are here ſaid to ſin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, defamed the Miracles wrought by *Chriſt*; ſo thoſe that ſinned under the Law *with a high hand* derided the Miracles wrought by *Moſes*.

Verſ. 36. *Note* m.] There are ſome who would have *Chriſt* to argue here *à minori ad majus*. q. d. If men muſt give an account even of *idle words*, much more muſt they do ſo of *ſlanderous ſpeeches*, ſuch as had been utter'd by the Phariſees. But there is not ſo much as the leaſt footſtep of this *à minori* in our Saviour's words. And therefore I rather think with *Dr. Hammond* that this word ἀργὸν implies ſomething in it more than ordinary bad. For tho it properly ſignifies *idle*, yet according to uſe, which often ſtretches the ſenſe of words beyond what is contain'd in their true original, it may ſignify ſomewhat more. When any man was ſaid to be ἀργὸς, the only meaning certainly was not that he had a great deal of leiſure, which may be true ſometimes of good and induſtrious perſons, but that he was a *lazy*, *ſluggiſh*, *ſtupid* Fellow, as the word is rendred in an old *Lexicon*. And ſo ἀργὸν ῥῆμα is not only a *vain* or *idle* word, ſuch as the Diſcourſe of trifling perſons is oftentimes full of; but alſo a *wicked* one, ſuch as is a means of corrupting the minds of the Hearers, and making

making them lazy and ſlothful, *i. e.* hindering them from doing any good works; and as a conſequence of that, occaſioning their running headlong into all manner of evil practices. And of this ſort were the Diſcourſes of ſuch men as the *Phariſees*, who, in reſpect of Piety, might be juſtly ſaid to be ἀργοὶ *ſlothful perſons*, performed no good works, but were wicked themſelves, and by their bad Converſation kept others from becoming ſober or ſerviceable. Their Diſcourſes were the Diſcourſes of ἀργῶν ὄντα ἀργῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὅτι τῷ ὁμοίαν ἀργίαν ἀκόλουθα ἄργους, *lazy men* (in point of Virtue) *and ſuch as induced the Hearers to be alike ſlothful.* This *Chriſt* more than once upbraids them with. See afterwards *Chap.* xxiii. 13. And in this place we have an inſtance of it in them, in their not only refuſing to believe *Chriſt* themſelves, but uſing Arguments to perſwade others that he was not to be believed, whilſt they wickedly aſcribed the Miracles that were done by him to the *Prince* of the Devils. So that I ſhould underſtand the word ἀργὸν not only in a *paſſive*, but alſo in an *active* ſenſe, *i. e.* that *Chriſt* ſpeaks of ſuch Diſcourſes as were not only without the leaſt ſpark of goodneſs in them, but had a bad influence likewiſe upon others. Thus the Doctrine of the *Stoicks* was by the reſt of the Philoſophers called ἀργὸς λόγος, in an *active ſenſe*, as appears from a paſſage in *Cicero* Lib. de Fato: *Nec nos impediet*, ſays he, *illa ignava quæ dicitur ratio* (*appellatur quidem à Philoſophis* ἀργὸς λόγος) *cui ſi pareamus nihil eſt omnino quod agamus in vita.* So ἀργὸς, of which ἀργὸς is but a contraction, is uſed alſo *actively*. Heſych. ἀργὸς, ἀργὸς ἢ κακοῦργος, *idle or miſchievous.*

Verſ. 42. Ἐκ μέσου τῆς γῆς.] See my Notes upon *Abd.* ver. 20.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 8. *Note a.* See my Citations out of *Pliny*, about the fruitfulneſs of *Egypt*, *Africa*, and *Sicily*, upon *Gen.* xli. 47.

Verſ. 12. Ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ἔχῃ, καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται.] i. e. He that makes an ill uſe of *God*'s benefits, ſo as that they prove almoſt inſignificant to him, and makes little or no advances in Piety, ſhall be ſo forſaken of *God*, as to fall even from thoſe firſt beginnings he has made in Virtue. Juſt ſuch another expreſſion, but in a different caſe, there is in *Juvenal*, Sat. iii. verſ. 208.

Nil habuit Codrus, quis enim negat? & tamen illud
Perdidit infelix totum nihil.

Verſ.

Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 21. Οὐκ ἔχει ῥίζαν.] The ſame Metaphor is uſed by *Quintilian*, de præcocibus ingeniis, *Inſt.* lib. 1. c. 3. *Non ſubeſt*, ſays he, *vera vis, nec penitus immiſſis radicibus, ut quæ ſummo ſolo ſparſa ſunt ſemina, celeriùs ſeſe effundunt; & imitatæ ſpicas herbulæ, manibus ariſtis, ante meſſem flaveſcunt. Their forwardneſs is not the effect of any ſettled ſtrength of Judgment, but they are like ſeeds ſcattered upon the ſurface of the ground, which preſently ſhoot up before they have taken any rooting; or like deep weeds growing amongſt the corn, which ripen before the Harveſt.*

Ibid. The Expoſition of this Parable is full of improprieties of ſpeech, ſuch as in their ordinary and daily diſcourſe it is uſual for men to be guilty of; but this does not make the ſenſe obſcure, becauſe the thing is of it ſelf ſo very manifeſt. We muſt not therefore criticize too much upon the words, but mind the thing it ſelf. *When any one*, ſaith Chriſt, *heareth the word of the Kingdom, and underſtandeth it not, the wicked one cometh and catcheth away that which was ſown in his heart: this is he which was ſowed by the way ſide.* It is juſt as if he had ſaid, and his meaning is no other than this; "That whoſo-"ever hears the Goſpel, and does not with all his heart entertain it, "is not long obedient to it; for the Examples and Speeches of wick-"ed men ſoon engage him to return to his former evil courſe. This "man is repreſented by that part of the field which is by the way ſide. After the ſame manner the reſt is to be expounded.

Verſ. 28. *Note* e.] That the Phraſe ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος is a Hebraiſm, may perhaps be true; but that Criticiſm is of no uſe here. For in this part of the Parable, where a Houſholder is repreſented as the Speaker, by a *man-enemy* is meant a *man*, and not the *Devil*.

Verſ. 35. Διὰ τοῦ Προφήτου.] It is ſtrange that in the antient Copies, ſtill extant, there ſhould be no footſtep to be found of that reading which is ſo often mentioned by S. *Jerom*, and which gave *Porphyrius* an occaſion to endeavour the leſſening the *Evangeliſts* Authority. *I have read in ſome Copies*, ſays he upon this place, *and perhaps any diligent Reader may find the ſame, in the place where we have put, and the vulgar Edition has* dictum eſt per Prophetam dicentem; *I ſay, I have read in ſome Copies* per Eſaiam Prophetam dicentem. *And becauſe no ſuch thing as is here mentioned was to be found in* Iſaiah, *I believe this was taken away afterwards by ſome prudent men; but I am apt to think that it was at firſt written* per *Aſaph* Prophetam *(for the 77th Pſalm, out of which this Teſtimony is taken, is entitled* a Pſalm of the Prophet *Aſaph) and that the firſt Tranſcriber did not underſtand what was meant by* Aſaph, *but thinking it to be a miſtake in the Writer, corrected it by putting* Iſaiah *into*

into its room, whoſe name was more familiar and better known. Much after the ſame manner he ſpeaks upon the 78*th* Pſalm; for all that is there ſaid on this head ſeems to be truly S. *Jerom*'s, tho there be perhaps, as *Eraſmus* thought, a great deal of another man's added to that Commentary. *It is ſaid therefore*, ſays he, *in St. Matthew*, Hæc facta ſunt ut impleretur quod ſcriptum eſt in *Aſaph* Propheta; *but ſome ignorant men took that away, and ever ſince that time, MANY Goſpels at this day have it*, Ut impleretur quod dictum eſt per *Eſaiam* Prophetam, *tho it was not* Iſaiah *that ſaid this, but* Aſaph. *In a word, that wicked wretch* Porphyrius *objects this very thing againſt us, ſaying, Your Evangeliſt* Matthew *was ſo ignorant as to ſay*, Quod ſcriptum eſt per Eſaiam, &c. —— *it was an error in the Tranſcribers, who wrote* Eſaiam *for* Aſaph: *for we know that the Primitive Church was gathered out of ignorant and unskilful people; and ſo reading in the Goſpel*, Ut impleretur quod ſcriptum eſt in *Aſaph* Propheta, *he that firſt tranſcribed the Goſpel began to queſtion with himſelf, who ſhould this* Aſaph *the Prophet be? and becauſe he was not known among the People, thinking it to be an error, and going about to correct it, committed one himſelf.* If we believe thoſe who have made it their buſineſs to collect the various Readings, there is no Copy now extant but what wants the *Prophet*'s name. But tho there was a very important reaſon for blotting his name out, the antient Tranſcribers had none at all for adding it; which is a thing that deſerves our conſideration, as well as what S. *Jerom* ſays beſides in that place. Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 54. Ναζαρέθ, i. e. *Nazareth*, where his Parents had fixed their habitation. One and the ſame man, as *Cicero* tells us, may have two diſtinct Countries. Lib. 2. de Legibus, *Municipibus duæ ſunt patriæ, altera naturæ, altera civitatis; ut ille Cato, cum eſſet Tuſculi natus, in populi Romani civitatem ſuſceptus eſt. Itaque cum ortu Tuſculanus eſſet, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam, alteram juris. Strangers that are free of any City have two Countries, one where they were born, the other the City of which they are made free; as the famous* Cato, *who having been born at* Tuſculum, *was admitted to the Privileges of a* Roman *Citizen: and ſo being a* Tuſculan *by birth, and by freedom a Citizen of* Rome, *he had one Country which was his native ſoil, and another where he was naturalized.*

Chapter XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

V. 5. middle of *Note* a. THis obſervation ſeems to be taken out of *H. Stephens*'s *Theſaurus*, and with very little care: for what is aſcribed to *Budæus*, *Stephanus* ſets down as out of the vulgar Lexicons; and thoſe which are cited for the words of *Xenophon*, are *Æſchines*'s; and *Budæus* interprets προκόπτω by *progredi facio*. So that it would have been better if the *Doctor* had left out what he here ſays.

CHAP. XV.

Chapter XV.

Verſ. 7. Πεπλήρωται] I do not think, with *Grotius*, and Dr. *Hammond*, that there is any reſpect here had to a further ſecond accompliſhment of a Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, whoſe words contain not a *Prediction* of any thing, but are only a *reproof* which he gives to the *Jews* of his time. But the reaſon of *Chriſt*'s uſing ſuch a form of ſpeech, is that *Iſaiah*, in deſcribing the *antient Jews*, did at the ſame time exactly repreſent the diſpoſition of their poſterity, even at that diſtance. And therefore the word προφητεύειν here muſt not be inſiſted on, the meaning of *Chriſt*'s words being no other than this: *the Prophet Iſaiah ſpake that of your forefathers which may very well be apply'd to you.* Something like this we may read in *Cicero*'s Orat. pro *Sextio* Cap. lvii. where that Prince of Orators tell us that a great many things out of antient tragedy ſuting his caſe, were by *Roſcius* and all the Romans accommodated to him; and after he had recited this Verſe, *O ingratifici Argivi, inanes Graii, immemores beneficii*, with a few more, he goes on thus: *illud ſcripit diſertiſſimus poeta pro me*; *i. e.* theſe things do ſo exactly fit my caſe, that if the Poet had wrote about me *on ſet purpoſe*, he could not poſſibly have deviſed any thing more ſutable. And juſt thus I ſhould here underſtand *Iſaiah*, to be figuratively ſaid to have *propheſied* that which did ſo well *agree* to the *Jews* in the time of *Chriſt*, as that if he had *really* had a reſpect to them, he could not have ſpoken otherwiſe.

Verſ. 19. *Note* c.] I. The phraſe *to proceed out of the heart* does not ſignify for any thing that lies hid in the heart to diſcover it ſelf by ſome external Action, but to have a Fountain in the Mind, which is the original of all our thoughts. And therefore it cannot be gathered from this phraſe that διαλογισμοὶ in this place ſignifies any thing more than *bare thoughts*. And indeed *Chriſt* oppoſes here thoſe things which

are

are conveyed from without into the body, to those which have their rise from the Mind, whether they are *latent*, or whether they *manifest* themselves by outward Actions. Nor do evil thoughts less defile a man whilst they remain *secret* in the mind, than when they are *expressed* in words. II. If there was a necessity of proving that διαλογισμοὶ signifies *Machinations* or *Consultations*, the way would not be to consider the significations of the *Noun* λόγος, but of the *Verb* διαλογίζεσθαι, from which the word διαλογισμὸς *immediately* comes, and which amongst other things signifies *to consult*. III. Our Author's reasoning from the sins here enumerated being disposed according to the *order* of the precepts of the *Decalogue*, besides that it is overthrown by comparing this with the parallel place in St. *Mark*, does by no means agree with St. *Matthew*'s way of writing, in which there is no such accuracy to be observed, no more than in the other writings of the *Apostles*. IV. As I do not deny but that part of the Wickedness spoken of in *Gen.* vi. 5. was the *murders* committed by those who lived before the Flood, so I am far from thinking that this is the *only* signification of those words *the imaginations of the thoughts of the heart*, and I am sure it cannot be proved to be so. In a word, the *Doctor* in this whole Annotation takes more pains, and uses greater subtilty than he needed to have done. It would have been sufficient for him to have shewn that διαλογισμοὶ does not only signify the *thoughts* of particular persons, but also the *consultations* of several persons together, and that *Christ* had a respect to both, and by that word was meant *all* kinds of evil thoughts and wicked consultations. Chapter XV.

Vers. 22. *Note* f.] I. I have not that Edition of *Pliny* which our learned Author made use of, nor *Budæus*; but I read the place in *Pliny*, in the late *Paris* Edition of *M. J. Harduin*, thus: *Qui subtilius dividunt circumfundi Syriâ Phœnicem volunt, & esse oram maritimam Syriæ cujus pars sit Idumæa & Judæa, deinde Phœnice, deinde Syria. Those that divide more subtilly tell us that Phœnice is comprehended in Syria, and is the Sea-coast of Syria, of which Idumæa and Judæa make a part, then Phœnice, then Syria:* where the word *circumfundi* signifies to be *contained* or *comprehended*, not *encompassed*, as the *Doctor* and *Pliny*'s interpreter thought, as appears by the following words, by which *Phœnice* is made a part of *Syria*, and not meerly a Country which *Syria surrounded*. And the reason why the *Phœnicians* are commonly called *Syrophœnicians*, is not because they border'd upon the *Syrians*, but because the same Persons were both *Syrians* and *Phœnicians* too; and that perhaps on purpose to distinguish them from the *Carthaginians*, or those *Phœnicians* who inhabited the Sea-coast of *Africa*. II. The *Barbarians* mentioned

Chapter XVI.

by *Laertius* in *Proæm.* can be no more the *Jews* than the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, *Brachmans*, or any other Nation which were all called by the *Greeks Barbarians*. I know the Fathers generally affirm that the *Greeks* borrowed a great many things from the *Hebrews*; but I know too, that the examples produced by them are not sufficient to prove it: for the Greeks might as well be beholden for every thing that they instance in, to the *Tyrians*, *Egyptians*, or *Chaldeans*, as to the *Jews*; or it may be they might invent them themselves. This I could easily demonstrate if this were a proper place for it.

CHAP. XVI.

Vers. 6. *Note* a. THO I will not deny but that the Sadduces favoured *Herod*, and so were *Herodians*, as *Grotius* has observed upon this place; yet I am inclined to think that *Herod* is mentioned by name instead of the *Sadduces* here in St. *Mark*, by reason he was a Sadducee or one that denied a future State; and so it was all one for the Evangelist to say *Herod* or the *Sadduces*. And this seems to me to be the more probable, because it does not appear, from the account we have of *Herod*, that he had any opinion peculiar to himself; whereas that the *Sadduces* had so is manifest, which therefore *Herod* rather seems to have embraced than the *Sadduces* any Doctrine of his, he having none that was properly his own.

Vers. 10. *Note* b.] Between κόφινος and σπυρὶς there is not the least difference, they both signify a vessel made of twigs worked together, and might be both of several shapes and sizes. And therefore that κοφίνῳ is used in one of the *Gospels* and σπυρὶς in another, seems to me to be by mere accident, not from any choice or design of the *Evangelist*. In the *old Glossaries*, Κόφινος is rendred by *Corbis*, *Corbula*, *Qualus*, *Cista*; and Σπυρὶς by *Sporta*, *Fiscella*, *Fiscina*. All which words tho different in sound have the same signification.

Vers. 13. *Note* c.] I should not think it at all strange if a *Roman* or *Grecian* Writer should say that *Cæsarea* was in *Syria*; because *Palæstine* was reckoned by the *Greeks* and *Romans* a part of *Syria*. But a *Christian*, that uses to follow the custom of the Scripture, which always makes a distinction between ארם *Syria* and *Canaan*, would have spoken more accurately, if he had said that *Cæsarea* was in the territory of the Tribe of *Manasse*, on the west side of *Jordan* in *Palestine* or *Judea*. But the contention between the *Jews* and the *Syrians*, which he afterwards mentions, was the reason doubtless why our *Author* thus spake.

Vers.

Verſ. 18. Εἶ πέτρος, ᾗ ὄνομα Πέτρῳ τῇ πέτρᾳ] Such another παρονομασία I have obſerved in my Notes upon *Gen.* xlix. 8. which ſee. Had Interpreters taken notice only of this, they would never have denied *Petrum* and *Petram* here to be one and the ſame man, viz. *Simon*, that eminent Member of the Apoſtolical Society. Conſult *Camero* in his *Prælect.* upon this place, or in his *Myrothec.* where he has put this matter beyond all doubt. Chapter XVI.

Ibid. *Note* g.] There are two things here to be conſidered in *Chriſt*'s words: 1. It muſt be enquired what the demonſtrative Pronoun αὐτῆς, which concludes this Verſe, is the Relative to. 2. What is meant by πύλαι ᾅδου *the gates of Hell.* As to the *former*, tho Expoſitors generally agree in making αὐτῆς to refer to the *Church*, which is its *immediate* Antecedent, yet it might be referred to πέτρᾳ *the rock* upon which the Church is built, or to *Peter* the *Apoſtle*; and this, notwithſtanding the Pronoun's being uſually the Relative to the Noun which moſt nearly precedes it; for it is frequently alſo to be joined with that which is fartheſt off, as Commentators have obſerved. See *Act.* vii. 19, 20. and x. 6. 2 *Joh.* ver. 7. And that here αὐτῆς ought rather to be referred to *Peter* than the *Church*, appears by the ſcope of *Chriſt*'s words: for his deſign in this place, as the thing it ſelf declares, and *Camero* has ſhewed, is to promiſe ſomething ſingular to *Peter*, who was no more concerned in the ſtate of the *future Church* than the reſt of the Apoſtles.

2. The phraſe πύλαι ᾅδου cannot otherwiſe be interpreted than according to the uſe of that phraſe in *Scripture* in which it occurs more than once. And we are not here to conſider what the word *Gates* ſignifies when it is alone, or joined with any *other* word, but what is the meaning of this phraſe πύλαι ᾅδου; for the ſignification of that word may be various, according as the place is in which it is found. Now no body will deny that πύλαι ᾅδου and *portæ mortis the gates of death* are the ſame; and this phraſe *the gates of death* ſignifies nothing but *death it ſelf.* So *Job* xxxviii. 17. *Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or haſt thou ſeen the doors of the ſhadow of death?* So Pſal. ix. 13. *Thou that lifteſt me up from the gates of death*, i. e. delivereſt me from death. So *Iſai.* xxxviii. 10. *Hezekiah* being in fear of an untimely death, ſays, *In the cutting off of my days I ſhall go to the gates*, שאר *i. e.* as it is rendered by the *Septuagint*, πορεύσομαι ἐν πύλαις ᾅδου, *I ſhall go to the gates of death.* So that the phraſe πύλαι ᾅδου ſignifies *death* it ſelf.

But what does *Chriſt* then mean, when he ſays that *the gates of hell ſhould not prevail* againſt *Peter*, or *not overcome him?* namely this; that the danger of a certain and ſpeedy death upon the account of his preach-

Chapter XVI. preaching the Gospel, should not deter him from discharging the office imposed on him, and so not *death* it self. So that *Jesus* in these words promises *Peter*, after he had professed his belief that he was the *Messiah*, that he should be a foundation of his Church, and constant in the profession of the Truth he had declared; which he fulfilled accordingly; for *Peter*, as we are told by *Clemens* Ep. c. v. οὐχ ἕνα οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης, *did not only undergo one or two, but many sorrows; and so becoming a Martyr, went to his proper place in glory.* We may apply to him that passage of *Seneca* as we find it in *Lactantius* Lib. vi. c. 17. *Hic est ille homo honestus, non apice, purpurâve, non lictorum insignis ministerio, sed nulla re minor, qui cum MORTEM in VICINIA videt, non sic perturbatur, tanquam rem novam viderit; qui sive toto corpore tormenta patienda sunt, sive flamma ore recipienda est, sive extendendæ per patibulum manus, non quærit quid patiatur, sed quam bene. This is that brave and honorable person, who is not remarkable for his fine hat of feathers, his purple robe, or his guard of Lictors, which is the least part of his glory; but who when he sees death just before him, is not surprized with the strangeness of the sight; and whether he is to undergo the torment of the rack, or to receive fire into his mouth, or have his arms stretched out upon a cross, does not regard what, but how well he suffers.*

There is one thing that may perhaps here be objected, *viz.* that according to this interpretation *Christ* does not keep to the Metaphor; for after he had called *Peter* a *stone*, he adds that *death* should not overcome him. It is true, but it was neither necessary that *Christ* should go on in the same Metaphor; nor yet supposing that what we refer to *Peter* did, as it is commonly thought, belong to the Church, will he be found to continue the same Metaphor. For he compares the Church to a *building*, which cannot properly be said to *be overcome by the gates of death*, but only to be pulled down or destroyed. Nothing is more ordinary in all sort of Writers than to begin with one Metaphor and end with another. As for instance, *Clemens* says a little before the words already alledged, concerning St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*: Ἐκκλησίας στῦλοι καὶ δικαιότατοι ἐδιώχθησαν καὶ ἕως θανάτου: *the faithful and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted even to death.* Pillars can neither *be persecuted* nor *dy*.

However, by this it appears that St. *Matthew* or his interpreter very fitly uses here the word κατισχύειν, which properly signifies to *overcome by force*; for this is what *Christ* means, that the terror of having a *violent* Death set before him, should not overcome St. *Peters* constancy; tho he saw *the gates of death* opened for him, yet he should notwithstanding

ſtanding hold faſt his pious reſolution. If any doubt of the ſignificati- Chapter
on of the verb καταχίειν, let them turn to the *Greek Indexes* to the firſt 5 XVI.
books of *Diodorus Siculus*, and the Roman *Antiq.* of *Dion. Halicarnaſſæus*, collected by *Rhodomannus* and *Sylburgius*, where they will meet with more examples than in any *Lexicons*. But it occurs likewiſe in the ſame ſenſe often in the verſion of the *Septuagint*. I know very well, that Interpreters commonly make uſe of theſe words to prove the perpetuity, if not alſo the ἀναμαρτησίαν *impeccability* of the Church; but they will never be able to evince any ſuch thing from this place by *Grammatical* reaſons. The thing it ſelf ſhews that the Church is liable to error, nor is there any mention made in this place of errors. That the Church has and always will continue, I do not in the leaſt doubt, becauſe of the nature and force of the Evangelical Covenant; but this cannot be concluded from theſe words, in which it is much more probable that St. *Peter* is ſpoken of; both what goes before and what comes after belonging to *him* and not to the *Church*. However I ſubmit the whole matter to the judgment of the Learned.

Verſ. 19. *Note* h.] I. It is certain, I confeſs, that there was a great difference between *that* Perſon's power who is ſaid to have had the *key of the houſe of David*, in *Iſaiah*, and his who is repreſented in the *Revelation* as carrying the *key of David*; but it would be hard to prove this from the *ſound* of the phraſes, if it were not *otherwiſe* plain and manifeſt: for the *key of David* is the key by which the houſe of *David* was open'd and ſhut, and therefore the ſame with the *key of the houſe of David*. Tho a *key* be an enſign of *power*, the key of *David* does not ſignify the power of *David* himſelf, but a power *over* the Kingdom of *David*. Our learned *Author* is not always happy in his ſubtilties about little things. However Mr. *Selden* has ſeveral Obſervations with relation to this matter, *lib.* 1. *de Synedriis*, cap. ix. which thoſe that will may read in himſelf.

II. Indeed for my own part, I do not doubt but that the *Apoſtles* committed the Government of the Churches to ſingle *Biſhops*, and accordingly that theſe ought to be reckon'd their *Succeſſors*; but as their Gifts were not alike, ſo neither was their Authority equal. And therefore whatever *Chriſt* ſays to the *Apoſtles* ought not preſently to be accommodated to *Biſhops*, at leaſt by the ſame Rule and in the ſame Latitude: Eſpecially in this place, where *Chriſt* promiſes to St. *Peter* and the *Apoſtles* ſomething extraordinary for the Confeſſion made by St. *Peter* in the Name of all the reſt, no *Grammarian* would ſay that the Apoſtles *Succeſſors* were alſo included: and therefore the words of *Chriſt* cannot, till the thing is firſt proved by Argument, be applied

Chapter XVI.

plied to Bishops; as if *Christ* had by these words alone conferred an *equal* Power upon the *Apostles* and their *Successors*. *Cyprian*, it's true, and some other *Bishops* did so interpret them, as if by virtue of these words of Christ they succeeded in the *Apostles* Rights and Privileges; but it were to be wish'd they had given their Grammatical Reasons for such an Interpretation of them.

Vers. 22. *Note* i.] Mr. *Fuller* is the first that ever explain'd this Phrase right, *Miscell. Sacr. lib.* ii. *c.* 2. where he shews that the word GOD must be understood, as if it were ἵλεώς σοι Θεὸς, *God be merciful or favourable to you*, i. e. *God* forbid it, and not be so angry with you as to suffer you to do such a thing. See likewise *H. Grotius*, who has confirm'd this in many places.

Vers. 24. *Note* l.] A Servant who is come to be under another man's power, no longer τῦ σώματ@ κρατῶ, i. e. *is his own Master*, as *Aristophanes* speaks in the beginning of his *Plutus*. He must do, not what he might do, if he were free, or what he thinks most fit to be done, but what his Master commands him, without any regard to himself. He may be said ἀπαρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν, that he should altogether depend upon the will of another. In the same manner *Christ* here would have his Disciples to resign themselves absolutely to the Will of *God*, renouncing all their former Desires, and resolving both to do and suffer whatever *God* should think fit to require of them. *To deny ones self* therefore is to conform ones self entirely to the Divine Will. In the place which the *Doctor* cites out of *Porphyry*, the Phrase πρὸς ἑαυτὸν does not signify *to himself*, but *his own House*.

Vers. 26. *Note* m.] Our learned *Author* is mistaken, for nothing is more common with all Writers than to join the Verb ζημιῶσθαι with an Accusative Case, as *H. Stephens*, *R. Constantin*, or any other Lexicographer whatever will inform us. Thus St. *Paul* says, *Phil.* iii. 8. τὰ πάντα ἐζημιώθην, *I have lost all things*; in which place there is no room at all for the Preposition κατὰ, which is a restrictive Particle; for the meaning of the *Apostle* is, that he had abandoned *all* and *every* of those things of which he there speaks. So likewise *Dionysius Halicarnasseus Antiq. Rom.* lib. x. p. 675. *Edit. Sylburg.* says, ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν θανάτῳ τε καὶ φυγαῖς καὶ ἐκβολαῖς ζημιωθῆναι, *to suffer loss by the death, reproachful treatment and banishment of famous Men.*

The Original of this Phrase is from the Attick way of speaking, in which Verbs very often govern an Accusative Case in Nouns of a near signification; and to speak properly according to that Dialect, we must say ζημιῶν & ζημιωθῆναι ζημίαν, not κατὰ ζημίαν: to which purpose is the Observation of *H. Stephens*, that the Greeks do not use to say

ζημιωθῆναι

ζημιωθῆναι ζημίαν θάνατου, but ζημίαν θάνατον, *to be punished with the Punishment of Death*, but *with the Punishment Death*. Besides, the *Doctor*'s Annotation is manifestly confuted by the parallel place in St. *Luke*, ch. ix. 25. where the Phrase is ἑαυτὸν ζημιωθεὶς, *losing himself*, not κατ' ἑαυτόν. It is past all doubt, that as *to save Life* does not signify in this Discourse of *Christ*, to save those things which concern or belong to Life, but Life it self; so to *suffer the loss of the Soul* is to lose the Soul, *i. e.* Life eternal. Chapter XVII.

Ibid. Ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς.] The meaning is, that there is nothing which is equally valuable with Life. This matter is well enough expressed by *Achilles* in *Homer*, Iliad. 1. ver. 401. & seqq.

Οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον, οὐδ' ὅσα φασὶν
Ἴλιον εὐπάσσαι ἐυναιόμενον πτολίεθρον.

For there is nothing seems to me fit to be laid in the Balance with Life, no not all the Wealth that they say is contain'd in the populous City of Troy, *&c.*

CHAP. XVII.

Vers. 5. Αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.] These words in *Moses*, Deut. xviii. 15. *Unto him ye shall hearken*, are not a *Prediction*, as the *Doctor* tells us in his Paraphrase, but a *Command*. See the place.

Vers. 24. *Note* e.] It is strange that our *Author*, when he had said that the name of *Drachms* came to the *Jews* after the time of the *Seleucidæ*, should produce as a proof of it, a place out of *Ezra* ii. 69. who lived in the Reign of *Cyrus*. Did he think that the Book of *Ezra* was written or altered after the time of *Alexander*? I do not believe so. It must be therefore an Error, occasion'd either through want of care, or that common Infirmity to which Human Nature is liable, which in so great a Man ought easily to be overlooked. Thinking with himself that דרכמון *Drachmon* was a Greek word, and knowing that the *Jews* had no Commerce with the *Greeks* before the time of the *Seleucidæ*, he imagined that that word was not *before* known to the *Jews*; and not taking sufficient heed to *Chronological* Accounts, alledg'd, before he was aware, that place out of *Ezra*. To the questi-

Chapter on, whether it was a double, ſacred or common *Shekel*, I have ſpoken upon *Exod.* xxx. 13.

XVIII.

Verſ. 25. *Note* ſ.] The *Doctor* juſtly rejects the ſecond Opinion mention'd by him, both for the reaſons alledged by himſelf, and for *this* alſo (which he paſſed over) that what is ſaid concerning the Prætor of *Syria* is perfectly falſe. The *Publicans* never exacted Tithes of the *Jews*, nor is there any mention made of *Syria* in *Cicero*'s Orations againſt *Verres*. In his third Book, and particularly where he accuſes *Verres*, he lays open the whole affair about the Tithes of *Sicily*, but there is not ſo much as one word about *Syria*. Without doubt the Author of this Opinion was deceiv'd by his Memory, which as he was writing ſuggeſted *Syria* to him inſtead of *Sicily*.

CHAP. XVIII.

Verſ. 6. Κατὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν] S. *Jerom* upon this place tells us that Chriſt *ſpeaks according to the Cuſtom of the Country, and the practice of the antient Jews, who uſed to puniſh extraordinary Crimes by drowning the guilty Perſon in the Sea with a Stone tied to him. Secundum ritum Provinciæ loquitur, quo majorum criminum iſta apud veteres Judæos pœna fuerit, ut in profundum, ligato ſaxo, mergerentur.* He had been more perhaps in the right if he had ſaid, *apud veteres Syros, the antient Syrians:* for, as *Grotius* has obſerv'd, we do not any where find that this kind of Puniſhment was us'd among the *Jews*. About this Puniſhment ſee *Iſaac Caſaubon* upon the LXVII Chapter of *Suetonius's Auguſtus*, where he relates how the Tutor and Miniſters of *Caius Cæſar* for taking the opportunity of his ſickneſs and Death to infeſt and ruin the Province by their Pride and Covetouſneſs, *were with a heavy weight put about their Necks thrown headlong into a River. Onerati gravi pondere cervicibus, præcipitatos eſſe in flumen.* And the place where that was done ſeems to be *Syria*.

Verſ. 7. Ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐστιν ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα.] *That is*, Men are ſo wicked, that they will certainly put Stumbling-blocks in others way, but they ſhall be ſeverely puniſhed for doing ſo; *namely*, becauſe there is no neceſſity of Mens *being* bad, tho when they *are* bad, and as long as they *continue* bad, they muſt needs be an offence to others. There is an Expreſſion not much unlike this in *Herodotus*, lib. 1. cap. vii. where he ſpeaks of the folly of *Candaules*, who was deſirous to have *Gyges* ſee his

his Wife all naked: χρόνῳ δὲ ὑστέρῳ διελθόντι (χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς) ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην: *not long after that (for it was* necessary *that* Candaules *should have some evil befal him) he said to* Gyges; *i. e.* Candaules was so foolish that he could not possibly avoid bringing by his folly some mischief upon himself. I remember that I have also read the Verb ΔΕΙ used much to the same purpose in *Aristophanes*, but the particular place *where* is out of my mind. Chapter XVIII.

Vers. 8. Ἡ χεὶρ σου, &c.] The sense of these words is admirably well expressed in one Verse of *Dionysius Cato*:

Quæ nocitura tenes, quamvis sint cara, relinquas.

Vers. 10. *Note* a.] *Grotius* ought to be read upon this place, tho I should by no means grant him that *Christ* does here make good the Opinion of the *Jews*, that every particular Man had a *Guardian Angel* assigned him. It was ground enough for *Christ* to speak as he did, that *Angels* had [*in general*] the care of Men committed to them, as Dr. *Hammond* well observes: And it was much at one whether they thought that every Man had constantly his own *Angel* to guard him, or that some number of them had the care of a whole Society, and upon some occasions of a particular Person. And therefore *Christ* neither contradicted nor justified either of these Opinions in particular, but left them in an uncertainty.

One thing there is which he here contradicts, *viz.* an Opinion that seems to have been common to the *Jews* with the *Heathens*, that according as Men differed in rank and condition, they had *more* or *less powerful Genius*'s appointed to watch over them: So that great and rich Persons were attended, they thought, with a *Genius* of greater Power and Might than those that were poor, or of the lowest rank. So *Plutarch* in the Life of *Antonius*, p. 930. Αἱ περὶ τὰς παιδιὰς ἅμιλλαι τ Αντωνίου πρὸς τὸν Καίσαρα θαττον φερόμενον. ὧν γὰρ τις αὐτὸν ἀντῆρε μάντις ὡς' Αλήστατος, ὅτι τοῖς χείροσι ὑπαποτάττοιτο ——— λέγων τὴν τύχην αὐτῶ λαμπροτάτην ὄσαν ἢ μείζονι, ὑπὸ τῆς Καίσαρος ἀμαυροῦσθαι. Καὶ συνεβούλευε πεῖραν τὰ τοῦ πολέμου ποιεῖν ἐκτὸς. Ὁ γὰρ σὸς, ἔφη ΔΑΙΜΩΝ τ τύτο φοβεῖται. Καὶ γὰρ ὧν ἢ ὑφηλὸς, ὅταν ἢ καθ' αὐτὸν, ὡς' ἐκείνης γίνεται παντοδύναμος ἐγκλίσαντος, ἢ ἀγαθίζεται. *The ludicrous Contentions that* Antony *had with* Cæsar *in his Childhood, and in which he was always beaten, vexed him to the heart. For he had a certain Fortune-teller with him out of* Egypt *that pretended to understand what Men were born to* —— *who told him, that tho his Fortune was great and extraordinary, yet it was obscured by* Cæsar's. *And therefore he advis'd him to*

Chapter XVIII. *ſeparate himſelf as far as poſſible from that young Prince. For, ſays he, your* GENIUS *is afraid of his Genius; and tho it is fierce and lofty when alone, yet at his approach it grows remiſs and cowardly.* Now what our *Saviour* here ſays, directly thwarts this Opinion; for he teaches us, that *Angels* of the higheſt dignity are appointed to take care τῶν μικρῶν, of *little ones.* For *to ſee the face of God*, is all one as to be permitted a near acceſs to him, as *Grotius* has obſerv'd.

Verſ. 15. Ἐὰν δὲ ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου.] Becauſe our *Author* in his Paraphraſe upon the 17*th* Verſe refers the Reader to his Treatiſe *of the Power of the Keys*, where he explains this place more largely, I ſhall take out thence what is not to be found in his Annotations, that thoſe who want that Book, may ſee fully what is Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion here.

" Mat. xviii. 15. *If thy Brother ſhall offend againſt thee:* it ſeems " the place belongs not primarily (but only *paritate rationis*, by " *analogy of Reaſon*) to all Sins in the latitude, but peculiarly to " *Treſpaſſes or perſonal Injuries* done by one *Brother*, one *Chriſtian* " to another; as beſides the expreſs words *v.* 15. (*if thy Brother* " *treſpaſs againſt thee*) is more clear by St. *Peter*'s *Queſtion* to the ſame " purpoſe, *v.* 21. *How oft ſhall my Brother treſpaſs againſt me, and I* " *forgive him?*

" *Go and reprove him*, ἔλεγξον, *i. e.* either *reprehend him* for it, " as the word is uſed ſometimes when 'tis join'd with παιδεύω, " *chaſten*, or diſcipline, *Heb.* xii. 5. *Apoc.* iii. 19. or again ἔλεγξον *, " *make him ſenſible* of the Wrong he hath done thee, or as it may " be rendred, † make him *aſham'd* of his Fact.

" *Betwixt thee and him alone*, *i. e.* do thy beſt by *private admonitions* " to bring him to a ſenſe.

" *If he hear thee*, be thus wrought on:

---

* Ἔλεγξις, φανέρωσις τῶν κεκρυμμένων, Phavor. & ἐλέγχω, τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἀπόπτυμα πρὸς εἰς φῶς ἄγω, καὶ ἁπλῶς τὸ ἀληθὲς φανερόω, ib. *and ſo* Joh. iii. 20. *He that doth evil cometh not to the Light, leſt his Deeds ſhould be reproved*, ἐλεγχθῇ [*diſcovered*] in our Margin: and therefore 1 *Cor.* xiv. 24. when 'tis ſaid of the *Unbeliever*, that he is *convinced of all*, &c. 'tis added *v.* 25. *Thus are the Secrets of his Heart made manifeſt:* ſo *Epheſ.* v. 13. *All things that are reproved*, or *diſcovered*, *are made manifeſt by the Light; for whatſoever doth make manifeſt, is Light.*

† ἐλεγχθῆσαι, αἰσχυνθῆσαι, & ἔλεγχε δὲ ἴσως αἰσχύνης πίφυται, & ἐλέγχειν ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰσχύνειν, Phavor.

Thou

" *Thou haſt gain'd thy Brother*; *gain'd him*, firſt to thy ſelf (gotten a Chapter
" *Friend* inſtead of an *Enemy*;) and ſecondly to Chriſt, *gained* a *Con-* XVIII.
" *vert*, a *Proſelyte* to him, and this alſo a great acquiſition to thee,
" to have had the honour of doing that glorious thing, and of be-
" ing capable of the *Reward* of them *that convert any to Righteouſ-*
" *neſs.*

" *But if he hear thee not*, if this firſt *method* of thy *Charity*, and diſci-
" pline of this calmer making ſucceed not, another eſſay muſt be
" made, another artifice uſed.

" *Take with thee* (ἔτι farther, or over and above) *one*, or *two*,
" that *in the mouth of two or three Witneſſes every word may be eſta-*
" *bliſhed*, i. e. that the thing which thou layeſt to his charge, be
" ſo *confirmed*; according to that *Joh.* viii. 17. *The Teſtimony of*
" *two Men is true*, i. e. of *ſufficient authority* in Law (according
" to an Hebraiſm, whereby נאמן, ἀληθὴς *true*, among the Greek
" Tranſlators ſignifieth πιστὸς, fit to be *credited*) that ſo either by the
" *Teſtimony* of theſe as *Witneſſes*, he may no longer be able to deny
" the Fact (as *Heb.* vi. 16. an *Oath* is ſaid to be εἰς βεβαίωσιν, for *eſta-*
" *bliſhing*, or *confirmation*, in that it is ἀντιλογίας πέρας, an *end of affirm-*
" *ing and denying*; the thing ſo *eſtabliſh'd* (βεβαιωθὲν or στηθὲν) by *Oath*,
" cannot be *denyed*, or the Parties denial will no longer ſtand him in
" ſtead) or by authority of theſe he may be induced (as the *Judg* is on
" the accuſed, *Deut.* xix. 15. *Heb.* x. 28.) to give *ſentence* on, to *con-*
" *demn himſelf*; which if it may be obtained, is the prime end of
" all theſe charitable Artifices, to bring the Injurious to a *ſight* and
" *ſhame*, the beſt Preparatives to Reformation: To which purpoſe
" is that of *Tertullian*, Apol. cap. 39. *Diſciplinam præceptorum incul-*
" *cationibus denſamus*, *We thicken the Doctrine of Precepts with ways of*
" *inculcating*, i. e. preſs them to Reformation whom our Doctrine
" will not prevail on; where he mentions theſe three degrees, *Exhor-*
" *tationes*, *Caſtigationes*, *Cenſura*; *Exhortations* and *Chaſtiſements*, and
" then *Cenſure.*

" *But if he hear not them* (παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, if he be ſtill refractory, either
" through *non-conviction* of the Fact, or *non-contrition* for it) if this
" *ſecond* Admonition be not in event εἰς οἰκοδομὴν, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 10. to
" *Edification*, or *Inſtruction*; if it work not on him,

" *Then tell it to the Church*, I ſhall tell you what that is pre-
" ſently:

" And *if he hear not the Church*, (continue his Refractorineſs ſtill)
" *let him be unto thee as a Heathen or a Publican*; which may

" poſſibly

Chapter XVIII.

" possibly signify, that in that case thou hast *liberty* to implead " him, as thou wouldst do any *Heathen* in any foreign *Heathen* " Court for that *Injury*, that *Trespass* done to thee, which was " at the first mentioned. For certainly though it were unlawful " for a *Christian* both here, and 1 *Cor.* vi. 1. to implead a Christi- " an for a *personal Trespass* before a *Heathen Tribunal*, yet to deal " thus with a *Heathen* (or *Publican*, which was in account the " same) was not either by *Christ*, or the *Apostle* counted unlawful " (but only the ἀδελφὸς μετ' ἀδελφῷ, i. e. *Christian with Christian*, v. 6.) " and consequently with a *perverse refractory Brother*, whom you see " *Christ* gives leave to account and deal with as with a *Heathen or* " *Publican*, it would not be unlawful also. But another *Interpretation* I " shall not doubt to propose and prefer, that by *Heathen and Publican* " may be meant a *desperate deplored Sinner*, such as the *Rabbins* call " חטא i. e. ἁμαρτωλὸς *a Sinner*, as in the Gospel γυνὴ ἁμαρτωλὸς, a de- " plored *Sinner:* Thus in *Musar*, *If he will not then* (i. e. *when two* " *or three Friends* have been taken to be present at his *Admonition*) *be* " *reconciled*, go and *leave him to himself*; *for such an one is implacable*, " and is called חטא, of whom again 'tis there said, *Si nec hoc modo* " *quicquam profecerit*, i. e. *adhibitis amicis*, if this second Admonition " do no good, *debet eum pudefacere coram multis*, *he must be ashamed* " *before many*, (which may be the meaning of *Dic Ecclesiæ*, *tell it to* " *the Church*, as will anon appear by 1 *Tim.* v. 20.) And this interpre- " tation of that Phrase will seem most probable, if you mark, 1. That " τελῶναι & ἁμαρτωλοὶ, *Publicans and Sinners* are frequently joyned to- " gether in the *Gospel*, as once *Publicans and Harlots*, those γυναῖκες " ἁμαρτωλοὶ *Sinner-women*. 2. That the Heathen are call'd κακοῖς *Sin-* " *ners*, as when 'tis said that *Christ* was by the *Jews delivered into the* " *hands of Sinners*, i. e. *Romans Heathen*, and in St. *Paul* [*not Sinners* " *of the Gentiles*] and then those words, [*let him be to thee a Heathen* " *and a Publican*] will sound no more, but [*give him over as a desper-* " *rate deplored Sinner*] to whom those Privileges of a *Christian* (*viz.* " of not being impleaded before an *Heathen Tribunal*) &c. do not " belong, *i. e.* leave him to himself. This sure is the simplest ren- " dring of the place; and then he that is such, that is capable of " that Denomination, is certainly fit and ripe for the *Censures* of the " *Church*, which follow in the next Verse, and are appointed to go " out against this *refractory incorrigible*.

" For so immediately it follows, *Verily I say unto you*; who are those " *you?* Why, 1. In the plural Number [ὑμῖν.] Secondly, ὑμῶν μαθηταῖς

" to

" to *you Disciples*, the same that were after made *Apostles*, (for so in Chapter
" the first verse προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ, the *Disciples came to him* with a XVIII.
" question; and *v.* 3. he said, *verily* I say to *you*, i. e. to *you Disciples*:
" and *ver.* 12. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; *what do you think?* asking the *Disciples*,
" or appealing to their own *judgment*, and so still the same Audi-
" tors continued, and his Speech addrest to them, *I say unto you Dis-*
" *ciples) whatsoever you shall bind on earth*, &c.

" After this, it follows *ver.* 19. *again I say unto you, that if two of*
" *you shall agree upon earth*, &c.] Many false illations are by men
" of different persuasions made from these words, which will all
" vanish, I conceive, and the truth be disinvolv'd, if the Reader will
" not despise this one *observation*, which I shall offer to him; and it
" is this, that the method oft-times used in Scripture is (when it
" hath proposed one or two severals to speak of) to resume the *last*
" *first*, and so orderly *to go back*, till it come to the *first*, to which
" you may accommodate that expression, and description of God's *me-*
" *thod* in other things. *Many that are last are first* (*the last in proposing*,
" first in *handling* or resuming) *and the first last*.

" Other Examples of this Observation I shall leave the Reader to
" observe, when he reads the *Scripture* more ponderingly, and only
" proceed to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three
" cases, it is apparent, are here mention'd orderly by our *Saviour*
" in the matter of *trespass*: 1. *Telling the Trespasser* of his fault *be-*
" *tween him and thee alone*. 2. *Taking one or two with thee*, to do
" it more convincingly, and with greater Authority. 3. *Telling*
" *the Church* of it. Having said somewhat to each of these, as he
" delivered them in the three first Verses, 15, 16, 17. he resumes
" the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, *ver.* 18.
" telling them what, after the not succeeding of the third admo-
" nition, the *Apostles* and their *Successors* are to do, when the cogni-
" zance of this injury and contumacy comes before them, (which,
" that in every case of trespass it always should, I conceive, doth
" not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the Ma-
" gistrate or *secular* Tribunal be *Heathen*, because that Supposition
" may perhaps be the ground of the *sit tibi Ethnicus*, on which this
" other is superstructed) viz. *excommunicate* such a *Refractory* till *re-*
" *formation*, and then upon that, *absolve* him again; and [*verily I*
" *say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth*, &c.] From this
" view it is not irrational to conclude, that the ἐκκλησία and the
" ὑμεῖς, the *Church*, and the *Disciples* (considered prophetically un-
" der

Chapter XIX.

" der the notion of *Apoſtles*, i. e. *Founders* firſt, then *Governours* of " *Churches*) may in that place ſignify the ſame thing. So ſaith " St. *Chryſoſtom* in *Mat. Hom.* 6. εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τουτέστι τοῖς προεδρεύουσι, " *Tell it to the Church*, i. e. to *the Preſident and Rulers of it*; and " *Theoph.* in *Matt.* xviii. ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίας προεδρίαν, &c. the *Church* for " the *Rulers of the Church*: To which purpoſe it is obſervable, what " *Kimchi* a *Jewiſh* learned *Rabbi* hath affirmed, that the *Governours* " and *Rulers* are oft meant by the word קהל, ἐκκλησία, or *Congre-* " *gation*; and ſo the word *People*, *Exod.* iv. 29. doth clearly ſignify " the *Elders*, not all the *People*, *Exod.* iii. 16. Agreeable to which " is the Inſcription of the *antient Apoſtolical Epiſtle* of *Clemens Ro-* " *manus* to the *Corinthians*, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικοῦσα Ῥωμὴν, *The* " *Church of God that dwells at Rome*, meaning I conceive by the Title " [*the Church*] himſelf (who wrote the *Epiſtle*, and was chief " there, or *Biſhop* at that time) and the other *Clergy* with him; " for ſo the other part of the Inſcription [τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κο- " ρινθον, *to the Church of God at Corinth*] is after explained by him " in the words Ἐπισκόποις, καὶ διακόνοις, *to the Biſhops and Deacons*. But " if this will not be acknowledged, then by ἐκκλησία I ſhall give " you leave to underſtand any *meeting*, or Congregation of pious men, " either a *conſeſſus Presbyterorum*, *a College of Presbyters*, which were " ordinarily aſſiſtant to the *Biſhop* in the antient *Church*, or poſſi- " bly the whole or any part of the *People* convened, whoſe Autho- " rity or conſent may work ſomewhat upon the Offender, as S. *Paul* " conceives it were apt to do, when he commands *Timothy*, ἁμαρ- " τάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἐλέγχειν, *to rebuke the offenders before all men*, i. e. " in the preſence of the community of the People, 1 *Tim.* v. 20. " and perhaps when he ſpeaks of the ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, 2 *Cor.* " ii. 6. *the rebuke that was by or under the many*, though it be not " certain whether that ſignify the *chaſtiſement*, (as our *Engliſh* reads) " *puniſhment* and *cenſure* inflicted by the *Presbytery*, or ὑπὸ under " them, thoſe aſſiſting or joining in the cenſure, συναγωγὴ, Acts " of *Canonical ſeverity*, (which in caſe of ſorrow and relenting of the " Offender upon *rebuke*, or admonition before ejection out of the " Church, were wont to be thought ſufficient without *excommunicati-* " *on*; and after *excommunication*, as in this place to the *Corinthians*, " if they were ſubmitted to, were ſufficient, tho not preſently to " reſtore him to the *Communion*, yet to make him capable of being " prayed for by the Church, 1 *John* v. 16. and to be delivered from " the ſtripes of *Satan*, the diſeaſes that the *delivering to Satan* in the

" *Apoſtles*

" *Apoſtles* times brought upon them;) or whether, as the words Chapter
" may be render'd, it import the *rebuke*, or reproof, *viz.* the third XVIII.
" *admonition* (or the ſecond given by the *Biſhop*, which was equiva-
" lent to that) which was ὑπὸ *under*, or *in the preſence of many*, viz.
" of the People or Congregation. The former of theſe ſenſes ſeems
" more agreeable to the place to the *Corinthians*, the latter rather
" to belong to that in 1 *Tim.* and ſo that which even now in *Mu-*
" *ſar* was *coram multis*, *before many*, and in St. *Paul* (if not ὑπὸ
" πλειόνων *under many*, yet) ἐνώπιον πάντων, *in the preſence of all men*,
" *Chriſt* may here expreſs by ἐκκλησία *the Church*. This Interpretati-
" on being admitted, or not rejected, it then follows commodiouſly
" and reaſonably, in the Text of the *Evangeliſt*, that after the
" matter is brought to them (*i. e.* to thoſe *many*) or after this
" act of *reproof*, or *rebuke before them*, and upon continued *refracto-*
" *neſs* to theſe laſt *admonitions*, then the ὑμῖν (that ſure is) the
" *Apoſtles* or *Governors* of the *Church*, the *Paſtors* (which cannot be
" in any reaſon excluded from under the former word ἐκκλησία
" *Church*, whatſoever it ſignifies) and thoſe already promiſed this
" *power*, chap. xvi. may, or ſhall *bind*, or *excommunicate* them.
" And that is the ſum of the 18*th* verſe in reference to the 17*th*.
" And then verſ. 19, *&c.*

Thus Dr. *Hammond*, who adds ſome things like what we have had already upon *Chap.* vii. 6. If any be deſirous of more, they may turn to the Treatiſe it ſelf, viz. *Power of the Keys*, Chap. ii. Sect. 6. *& ſeqq.* We ſhould compare theſe things with what *Grotius* ſays upon this place of S. *Matthew*, which is a great deal more plain and natural. The *Doctor* takes for granted, what he ought to have proved, that *Chriſt* ſpeaks to his Apoſtles as the *Governours* of the Church.

Verſ. 23. *Note* c. Δούλων.] The Eaſtern People uſed but one word עבד *hebed*, to ſignify both *miniſtros liberæ ſortis*, *Servants who were at their own diſpoſal*, and *Mancipia*, *Slaves*, as I have obſerved in my Notes upon *Gen.* xx. 8. And δοῦλος in the *Greek* Interpreters and Writers of the New Teſtament has alſo the ſame ambiguity in it. But when we ſpeak *Latin*, there is no reaſon why we ſhould not uſe various words, according to the nature of the ſubject ſpoken of. Thus thoſe whom S. *Matthew* here calls δοῦλοι ought to be render'd by *Miniſtri*, *Servants*, becauſe *Slaves* or δοῦλοι are never ſold by their Maſter that he may have what is owing him paid.

Verſ. 28. *Note* d.] The Verb ἔπνιγε is uſed here in its proper ſignification; for when we take any man by the Collar, and hale him

Chapter XIX. along againſt his will, we almoſt *choak* him. The *Latin* Phraſe for it is *obtorto collo trahere*, which *Eraſmus* here makes uſe of. So *Plautus in Pœnulo*, Act. iii. Sc. 5. ver. 45.

Priuſquàm hinc obtorto collo ad prætorem trahor.

Which is well interpreted by learned men, *to take hold of a man's collar, and ſqueeze his jaws together, and then drag him along.* So a *Philoſopher* is repreſented by *Lucian in Hermotimo*, demanding his pay of one of his Scholars, and haling him before the Juſtice or *Prætor*, περιβεὶς αὐτῷ περιῤῥαντήριον καὶ ἕλκων τεθύλλον, *having thrown his cloak about his neck.* And in the ſame Author, in *Lapithis*, this Stoick Philoſopher is reproached with this very thing thus: οὐδὲ ἄῤῥω τοὺς μαθητὰς, ἵνα μὴ κατὰ καιρὸν ἀπολάβω τὰς μισθούς: *nor do I take my Scholars by the throat and drag them before the Juſtice, if they do not pay me my ſtipend when it is due.* See alſo the *Dial.* between *Æacus*, *Proteſilaus*, *Menelaus* and *Paris*.

Verſ. 35. Οὕτως καὶ ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐπουράνιος ποιήσει.] Every body muſt perceive that theſe words cannot be urged to ſignify that the Juſtice of *God* will in its Retributions take notice of every ſingle *circumſtance* in the ſins of men. We muſt conſider only the main ſcope of *Chriſt*, which is no more than that thoſe who do not forgive their Brethren their Offences, ſhall not obtain forgiveneſs from *God* for theirs. This is all therefore that can be concluded from this place; not as the *Doctor*, and *Grotius* before him, ſays, that Sins which are once pardoned in this life may be again charged upon a man. If we conſider the thing in it ſelf, 'tis *then* only that *God* paſſes Judgment upon men, when after the courſe of their life is ended, they are ſent into the place of Rewards or Puniſhments. So that *that* is the time when perſons are pardoned or condemned; and there is no need of any *previous* Sentence.

CHAP. XIX.

Verſ. 8 Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν.] But you will ſay then, that to ones thinking *God* ſhould have changed it: *True*, if it were the ordinary way of *God* to change the diſpoſitions of men by the exerciſe of his *infinite* power; but becauſe in order to that end he for the moſt part makes uſe of Laws, Threatnings, Promiſes, and ſuch other means, he could not poſſibly have acted otherwiſe than he did, when no Laws could prove effectual to reform the *Jews* as to this point of the hardneſs of their hearts. He would not therefore require of them what he knew they would never do. And this was partly the reaſon

reaſon that *Solon* went upon, when he reformed the ſevere Laws made by *Draco*, as *Plutarch* in his Life tells us: Δεῖ σοφὸν τὸ νόμιμον γεγράφοντα ἢ νόμον, εἰ βέλτιστα χρήματος ἕνεκα, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολλοὺς ἀχρήστως κολάζειν: *He that makes Laws muſt conſider the poſſibility of their being obſerved, if he intends to puniſh but a few, and do good by it, and not a great many to no purpoſe.* Chapter XIX.

Verſ. 12. *Note* a.] The place in *Ariſtophanes* is in *Nub.* p. 151. *Edit. Genev.* and needs no Correction, no more than S. *Matthew* did this Rapſody, to explain his meaning, occaſioned by a fooliſh Etymology of the word Ἰησοῦς.

Verſ. 24. *Note* c. *lin.* 10. after the words *hole of a needle.*] Theſe words are in *Beracboth* fol. 55. 2. and the foregoing in *Babametſia* fol. 38. 2. as they are rightly cited by *J. Buxtorf* in פילא and Mr. *Lightfoot* in *h. l.*

Ibid. *at the end of that Note.*] *Bochart* has treated much more accurately concerning this Proverb in *Hieroz. Part.* 1. *l.* 11. *c.* 5. We may learn from him, in oppoſition to what the *Doctor* thought, 1. That there was no need of *Chriſts* changing the *Elephant* into a *Camel*, as the Beaſt which was moſt known, ſince the word κάμηλος amongſt the *Jews* who uſed the Greek Language might ſignify a *Cable* as well as a *Camel*, the word גמל amongſt the *Arabians* and *Syrians* ſignifying *both*. 2. That it was as common with the *Jews*, when they ſpake of a difficult thing, to ſay that the performing it was like making *a Cable to paſs through a narrow hole.* I cannot alſo but wonder why the *Doctor* makes *Phavorinus* the Author of that Interpretation of the word κάμηλος for a *Cable*; when *Phavorinus* quotes *Theophylact*, who was much older than himſelf, to the ſame purpoſe, and without doubt followed *him* in that Interpretation of it. The word *Cable*, as *Bochart* and others have obſerved, came rather from the *Phœnician* word חבל *chebel*, which ſignifies *a rope.* To conclude, we muſt be cautious how we correct *Heſychius* in the word κάμος, for κάμηλος cannot be ſaid to be any *part of a ſhip*, tho the place where the fire is kindled may fitly be called κάμος. Beſides, *Phavorinus* has both κάμηλος and κάμινος diſtinct, whence it appears he did not borrow from *Heſychius* what he ſays about the word κάμηλος.

Verſ. 28. *Note* d.] It is indeed truly obſerved by the *Doctor*, that the παλιγγενεσία or regeneration here ſpoken of, is not like that of the *Pythagoreans*; but he might have added that it was of a nearer ſimilitude with that of the *Stoicks*, and that the *Stoick* Philoſophers were the firſt that uſed this word to expreſs the Reſtoration of the World after the burning of it. Tho in the circumſtances they differ very much in their opinion from the *Chriſtians*, yet in the general they agree as to

Chapter XIX.

this, that the World shall be first consumed by Fire, and then afterwards restored; and the Christian Writers, who knew the thing more certainly, and came another way by their knowledg, seem to have borrowed the word παλιγγενεσία, in this sense, from them. *Philo*, in his book *de Incorruptibilitate mundi*, p. 728. *Ed. Genev.* after he had spoken of the conflagration of the World, proceeds thus in giving an account of the *Stoicks* opinion: ἐξ ὧν πάλιν ἀναῤῥύησιν κόσμου ἴσασιν αἰσιωδεστάτην τοῦ πεχυίτος, *from which* the Stoicks say *that there shall be another regeneration of the World*, brought about *by the Providence of its Author.* Δύναται ᾗ κατ' αὐτοὺς, ὁ μὲν τις κόσμος ἀΐδιος, ὁ δέ τις φθαρτὸς λεγέσθω. φθαρτὸς μὲ ὁ κατ' διακόσμησιν. ἀΐδιος ᾗ ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἐκπυρώσεως ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑΣ καὶ ἀνακύκλησιν ἀθανατιζόμενος ὕστερον λεγέσθω: *Now according to these mens opinion, it may be said that there is one World which is eternal, and another which is corruptible; the corruptible one, so called, because of its Constitution; the eternal one, that which after its Conflagration, will by the perpetual* REGENERATIONS *and Revolutions of it be render'd immortal.* And often in that book he uses the word παλιγγενεσία in this sense. So *Marcus Antoninus*, Lib. xi. Sect. 1. saith, Τῷ ἀκριβεῖ παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὅλων ἐπακολουθεῖν: *it perfectly comprehends* (viz. human Reason) *the periodical regeneration of all things.* So *Eusebius Præp. Evan.* Lib. xv. c. 19. shews out of *Boethus*, ὅπως δοξάζουσι οἱ Στωϊκοὶ περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας τῶν ὅλων, *what the Stoicks think about the Regeneration of all things.* And so likewise others speak of this opinion, which puts it out of all doubt that this word was borrowed from the *Stoicks*, who had a great many more of the same kind peculiar to their Sect. *Seneca*, in his *Nat. Quæstion.* Lib. iii. c. ult. saith, *Omne* EX INTEGRO *animal* GENERABITUR, *dabiturque terris homo inscius scelerum, & melioribus auspiciis natus. Every living creature shall be regenerated, and the earth shall have men to inhabit it, that shall not know what it is to be vicious, and whose birth shall be attended with better tokens.* About the opinion it self see *Just. Lipsius* Phys. Stoicæ, Lib. ii. c. 22.

But to pass over this, we must observe, that tho in some sort the *regeneration* of Mankind is begun by the preaching of the Gospel, yet what is here said cannot in any wise be understood of that initial regeneration; for in what sense can the *Apostles* be said *to have sat upon twelve thrones, and judged the twelve tribes* upon earth? And therefore most of the Fathers, St. *Austin* himself not excepted, understand the words of *Christ* of the time after the Resurrection. See the Passages which *Suicer* has collected under this word in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus.*

I wish our Author had warranted by sufficient testimonies what he says in concurrence with *Grotius*, about the authority of the φυλάρχαι or *heads of the tribes* among the *Jews.* For tho it be evident from the i, ii, and vii,

vii, &c. *Chapters* of *Num.* that there were ſuch Perſons in the Camp of the *Jews* in the time of *Moſes* as were called φυλάρχαι, yet we find afterwards no mention made of them, nor were the *heads of the tribes* Judges in the *Apoſtles* time. I rather think that when *Chriſt* ſpake of *twelve Thrones* he had no regard at all to the φυλάρχαι, but only to the number of the *Apoſtles*; and that he did not aſſign each man his own Tribe, but made them every one Rulers over them all. And that expreſſion of *the Thrones*, I rather think to be an alluſion to the Seats of the *Sanhedrim*, the Council of 72 Men, who were the chief Judges in *Iſrael*, than to the Seats of the φυλάρχαι, about which the Scripture is wholly ſilent. It is a very unhappy thing, that great men do often take things that are doubtful for known and certain, and uſe them as confirmations of what they ſay; for from uncertainties nothing but uncertainties can be concluded, and no man is obliged to believe what another ſays meerly becauſe he *ſays* it.

Chapter XX.

Verſ. 29. *Note* e.] Of ſuch fruitfulneſs as this, ſee my Notes upon *Gen.* xli. 7.

CHAP. XX.

Verſ. 15. *Note* b. I Do not at all doubt but that *Chriſt* often made uſe of *Proverbs* and *Phraſes* borrowed from the common way of ſpeaking amongſt the *Jews*, as learned men, and in particular Dr. *Lightfoot*, has ſhewn; but that he borrowed *whole parables* or ῥήσεις *entire diſcourſes*, I can by no means think. It does not ſeem to be the part of an *inſpired* Teacher to propoſe to his hearers Parables that were vulgarly uſed, for his own. And indeed it does not appear that any body uſed them before *Chriſt*'s time; for thoſe which are alledged out of the *Talmudical* or other *Jewiſh* Writers, were all written ſome ages after *Chriſt*'s birth. As for inſtance, this Parable of the *Houſholder and the Labourers*, which is extant in the *Jeruſalem Gemara*, was written an age and a half at leaſt after the Deſtruction of the Temple. And this being ſo, it ſeems to me a great deal more probable, that the Author of the *Jeruſalem Gemara*, or whoever it is that is there repreſented as uſing this Parable, did it in imitation of *Chriſt*, than that he owed it to any antient tradition. The ſame I ſay of many others, as of that which learned Men produce upon *Matt.* xviii. 17. out of the book *Muſar*, and of another Parable like that, which we have afterwards in Chap. xxv. 1. & *ſeqq.* Or if this conjecture be not approved, it would not be perhaps abſurd if one ſhould ſay that ſometimes the *Jews* happened upon the ſame thoughts with *Chriſt*; juſt as we ſee the *Heathen* Writers, who undoubtedly never read the Scripture,

Chapter XX. ture, did by accident ſometimes ſay much the ſame things. I had rather ſay *ſo*, than imagin *Chriſt*, juſt like a *Rabbi*, repeating what he had learned from his Maſters, as if he had not been *ſelf taught*. Let this ſuffice for what may be ſaid upon this and other the like places in our Author. It muſt be obſerved here beſides, by the way, that the Hebrew words נטל שכרו משלם are not rightly tranſlated by the Doctor, *he hath received his hire in peace*, but ought to be render'd, *he received his whole hire*. He ſeems in his haſte to have read בשלום *Bſchalom*, tho that has no ſenſe in it here.

Verſ. 16. *Note* c.] In this long Annotation wherein the *Doctor* has taken ſo much pains, there are ſeveral things fit to be approved of, and others that may, with good reaſon, be found fault with, eſpecially in the firſt part of it. I ſhall, without making any reflection upon ſo great a man, ſet down thoſe things which ſeem to need correction.

I. If it were his deſign to expreſs and accurately diſtinguiſh the proper and figurative ſignifications of the word καλεῖς, he ſhould have begun with the proper ſignification of the *Primitive*. Καλέω properly ſignifies *to call* any perſon *by name*, with a deſign to ſpeak to him, or admoniſh him of any thing, or to obtain ſomething of him. Hence, by a figure, it was uſed to ſignify ſeveral things. For inſtance, καλέω is *to invite* to a feaſt, becauſe he that is ſo invited is called upon by name; which there was no need of proving, nothing being, in all Writers, more common. And hence κλητὸς is put to ſignify one that is *called* to a feaſt, as in *Homer Odyſſ.* p. verſ. 386.

II. The *Doctor* had not look'd into that place in 1 *King.* i. 41, 49. where the קרואים *called* are manifeſtly thoſe that were *invited to a feaſt*. See v. 9. of that *Chapter*. Read but the place, and you will ſee that nothing can be more foreign to the ſenſe of it, than to interpret the *called* there to be the *Adonijans*, or thoſe that *adhered to Adonijah*, when the diſcourſe is about *Gueſts*, and the Hebrew Language will not bear to have קרואים אשר לאדניה *the invited that were preſent with Adonijah*, underſtood of ſuch as were called by his name, as being of his *ſide* or *party*. 'Tis a miſtake alſo that thoſe who are ſtiled קראים in 2 *Sam.* xv. 11. ought to be underſtood to be any other than they commonly are. They were *Abſalom*'s friends whom he called, as to a Feaſt, which, as he ſaid, he was about to make in *Hebron* at the time that he paid his pretended vow; and yet they had no ſhare in his Conſpiracy, for it is expreſly denied by the ſacred Writer, nor could they be called *Abſalomians*. By this it appears, that the Obſervation which Dr. *Hammond* hereupon makes, is vain.

III.

III. In that place of *Ariſtotle*, near the end of *lib.* ii. of his *Oeconomicks*, there is no connexion between θεσσαλίμους Σαλεμίτας and the word κλητὸς, for theſe are the words; Τηρήσας τὰς τε Σαλεμίτας ἅπαντας θεσσαλίμους ὄντας, καὶ στρατιώτας, οὐκ ὀλίγους τε πρέσβεις, καὶ τεχνίτας κλητοὺς ἄλλους ἄγοντας: *he obſerved all the Governours*, Satrapæ, *who were expected* (*viz.* to come to Babylon) *and the Soldiers, and not a few Embaſſadors, and Artificers leading others that were ſent for.* Theſe τεχνίτας ſeem to have been *Fidlers*, or any other ſort of Muſicians, who carried others along with them to *Babylon*, in order to make a Conſort: for κλητὸς ſignifies one that is *ſent for* or *choſen out* by name. So *Homer* Iliad. 1. v. 165. calls the Embaſſadors, which were choſen out of the Captains, and ſent by *Agamemnon* to *Achilles*, κλητοὶ, *i. e.* as *Euſtathius* interprets it, ἐξονομακλήδην ἐπιλεκτοὶ, *pitched upon by name*, or as the *Scholiaſt* ἐξ ὀνόματος κεκλημένοι. Chapter XX.

IV. The *Septuagint* cannot be juſtified from the charge of having barbarouſly and improperly tranſlated מקרא קדש κλητὸς ἁγία, ſince not only the thing it ſelf, but Grammar, ſhews that it is a *holy Convocation* that is there ſpoken of. See my Notes on *Exod.* xii. 16. Their deſign, as it ſhould ſeem, was to ſay that the days upon which holy Aſſemblies were kept, were called *holy days*, which is indeed true; but the place was improper for it, and they expreſſed themſelves contrary to the Rules of Grammar: for to put κλητὴ ἁγία ἔσται for ἁγία κληθήσεται, is intolerable. However, κλητὴ is indeed the ſame with ἐπίκλητος, but this word ſignifies *called* not *renowned*. Nevertheleſs, to ſpeak freely, it may perhaps be imagined that where we find κλητὴ or ἐπίκλητος, we muſt ſuppoſe the *Subſtantives* ἐκκλησίαν or συναγωγὴν to be underſtood; ſo that ἡμέρα ἡ ἑβδόμη κλητὴ ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῖν may be put for ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ κλητὴ συναγωγὴ ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῖν. This is certainly the meaning of *Moſes*, whoſe words the *Doctor* manifeſtly ſtrains. A feſtival day was called πανήγυρις ἁγία, becauſe there was *a holy Convocation* or ſolemn Aſſembly of the People, kept on that day.

V. The ἐπίκλητοι συναγωγῆς in *Numb.* i. 16. are thoſe that were *choſen* or *called by name* out of the Congregation. The קרוא מועד in chap. xvi. v. 2. of the ſame Book, are the *called together of the Aſſembly*, and קרוא עדה *the called out of the Aſſembly* or *to the Aſſembly*. In the former place the *Septuagint* have, and that rightly, συγκλητοὶ βουλῆς thoſe that were *called to the Council*, and in the latter ἐπίκλητοι τῆς συναγωγῆς, which is to the ſame ſenſe. So *Xerxes* in *Herodotus* takes counſel about his flight ἅμα Περσέων τοῖσι ἐπικλήτοισι, *with the Perſians called together about him.*

VI. I admire that our learned Author, whilſt he was inquiring into the ſignification of the word κλητὸς in the Old Teſtament, had no regard

Chapter XX. regard almoſt to its primitive καλέω; which often occurs in the *Septuagint*, and is frequently made uſe of in the books of the *Prophets*, to ſignify what *God* did, when he called the People of the *Jews* to the knowledg of himſelf. See *Iſa.* xliii. 1. and xlv. 3, 4. In the *ſame* Prophet we might have read κλητὸς in this ſenſe, if the *Septuagint* had pleaſed, Chap. xlviii. 12. *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and thou Iſrael* מקראי mkoraï, *my called* κλητί μου. Hence κλῆσις alſo is taken for the Exhortation of the *Prophets*, calling the People to the Worſhip of *God*, *Jerem.* xxxi. 6. And this is the ſenſe in which κλῆσις and κλητὸς are uſed in the New Teſtament; nor does the difference of Circumſtances make any change at all in their ſignification, as appears by what the *Doctor* has ſaid, who is but too curious and accurate in diſcuſſing the places where they are found. Several of them might from the Signification I have here given, be more *grammatically* and ſimply interpreted.

VII. I am ready to believe that this Phraſe *Many are called but few are choſen*, is a proverbial form of Speech, as *Grotius* remarks, which alludes to that more ſublime ſenſe in which the words *Calling* and *Election* are uſed in the New Teſtament, but has another different original; which, if I am not miſtaken in my conjecture, is from the way of muſtering and chooſing Soldiers, when all that were fit to carry Arms were ordered to preſent themſelves upon ſuch a certain day, and ſo were *called* to ſome particular place, where when more had met than were neceſſary to carry on the War they were going to be engaged in, the moſt valiant only were *choſen*: So that there were *many called and few choſen*. Thus when *Gideon*, Judg. vii. had *called* or ſummoned together *many* to repulſe the *Midianites* who made War with the People of the *Jews*, there were but *few choſen* to perform that Service. See alſo *Joſh.* viii. 3. And ſo likewiſe *Chriſt*, Luk. vi. 13. *called unto him his Diſciples*, which were many, *and out of them he choſe twelve, whom alſo he named Apoſtles.* The meaning therefore of this Proverb *Many are called and few are choſen*, is this, that among many that undertake the ſame thing, there are few that excel, and deſerve to be preferred before others. And this ſenſe very well agrees with the ſcope of the Parable that *Chriſt* makes uſe of; which is, that there are but a very few of thoſe that believe, who are worthy of an extraordinary reward.

Verſ. 28. Δῶναι ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.] Interpreters here juſtly inſiſt upon the force of the particle ἀντὶ, which denotes a Subſtitution whereby *Chriſt* died not only for our *good*, but in our *place* or *ſtead*. And ſo the *Heathens*, in a matter of this nature, underſtood that Particle. Thus *Alceſtis* ſaith in *Euripides*:

Ἐγὼ

Ἐγὼ σε περισῴζουσα, καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐμῆς
Ψυχῆς παταστήσασα φῶς τόδ' εἰσορᾶν
Θνήσκω, παῖ· σοὶ μὲν ὡς μὴ δακεῖν, ἐμοὶ δ' ἰδεῖν.

I honouring you, and substituting your seeing this light in the room of my life, die, when I might refuse to die for you.

And *Ovid. de Art. Amand.* lib. 3. speaking of the same Woman, says,

Fata Pheretiadæ conjux Pegasæa redemit,
Proque viri est uxor funere lata sui.

The Particle ὑπὲρ has also the same signification, as appears by the last Verse of that passage of *Euripides*. The Heathens in those first Ages, and not only then, but also in latter times, thought that any one might escape Death, if another put himself into his place. *Aristides*, who was of the same Age almost with the Emperor *Adrian*, tells us in V. *Sacrarum*, that when he was dangerously sick, he was admonish'd by an Oracle, ὅτι ἡ Φιλουμένη ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ σῶμα ἀντὶ σώματος ἀντέδωκε, τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἀντὶ τῶν ἡμῶν. *That Philumena* (one that was nursed with the same Milk) *gave Life for Life, and Body for Body, her's for his.* See more Examples to this purpose in *Isaac Casaubon* upon *Suetonius*'s Caligula, *cap.* xiv. and *Spartianus*'s *Adrian*, upon which consult also *Salmasius*. Such Persons as these were called ἀντίψυχοι, which is a word often us'd by *Ignatius* in his Epistles, concerning which read Dr. *Pearson*'s Vindiciæ, *Part* 2. *cap.* xv.

Vers. 29. *Note* d.] It were to be wish'd that Dr. *Hammond*, as well as others who quote that Greek and Latin Manuscript, had given us also the Latin Version out of it, or rather that it were published entire. But in the mean time, the more I consider the various readings of that Manuscript, as they are set down both in many places of *Beza*, and in the *Oxford Edit.* of the *New Testament*, the more I am confirmed in the Opinion which I have sometime since made learned Men the Judges of, *viz.* that that *Manuscript* does not so much contain the words of the *Evangelists* as of some *Paraphrast*, who now and then fills up what he thought was wanting, and where the Greek was not good mended the Language; and all that will but examine it with a particular care will be of the same Opinion. The Paraphrase of *Epictetus*'s *Enchiridion* published by *Meric. Casaubon*, is much such another, in which there are most of *Epictetus*'s words set down, but often in a different order and with several Enlargements. And therefore I disagree with the Doctor in his suspecting that St. *Matthew* ought to

Chapter XXI.

be ſupplied out of that one *Manuſcript*, which all the reſt contradict, it being more probable that that Addition is taken out of St. *Luke*, tho with ſome Alterations. But I ſay again, that it were to be wiſhed that that Copy were publiſhed entire; and thoſe who keep up ſuch things to be burnt by the next Fire, are not to be commended.

Since the writing of this, I have happened to ſee ſome new Annotations upon the New Teſtament made by *R. Simon*, who is of the ſame Opinion with me, *viz.* that this Copy of *Beza* is nothing but a Compoſition made out of the four Goſpels compared with one another. And this ſame Addition which Dr. *Hammond* mentions, he found alſo in thoſe antient Manuſcripts which have the Latin Verſion as it was before it was corrected by S. *Jerom.* He tells us *Part* 1. *c.* 2. that he had read theſe words in the Latin Manuſcript of the four Goſpels, which is extant in the *Jeſuits* Library at *Paris*: *Vos autem quæritis de puſillo creſcere, & de majore minores eſſe. Intrantes autem & rogati ad cœnam, nolite diſcumbere in locis eminentioribus, ne forte clarior te ſuperveniat & accedens, qui ad cœnam vocavit te, dicat tibi adhuc deorſum accede, & confundaris. Si autem in loco inferiori diſcubueris, & ſuperveniat humilior, dicet tibi qui ad cœnam vocavit: accede ſurſum, & erit tibi hoc utilius.* The ſame he tells us, *Part* 2. *c.* 21. there is in another Copy in the *Colbertine* Library, and likewiſe in the *King*'s MS. and ſome others of which he treats.

CHAP. XXI.

Verſ. 7. Ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.] Our *Author* underſtands this rightly of the *Colt.* Αὐτῶν is improperly put for αὐτῷ or ὄναριον. See what I have ſaid upon this place in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. Sect. 1. cap. 10.

Verſ. 9. *Note* a.] About the cuſtom of *carrying Boughs*, ſee my Notes upon *Levit.* xxiii. 40. I cannot readily agree with the *Doctor* in what he ſays about the typical ſignification of the *Feaſt of Tabernacles*: All the ground that he has for that Conjecture, is only S. *John*'s making uſe of the word ἐσκήνωσεν, ch. i. 14. which does not neceſſarily allude to the *Feaſt of Tabernacles*.

Verſ. 12. *Note* b.] I cannot imagine what ground our Author had to ſay, that the Jews were bound to go up to *Jeruſalem* to pay their *half Shekel*, it being no where commanded in the *Law*, and the contrary being manifeſt from *Chap.* xvii. 24. of this Goſpel, where *Chriſt* is ſaid to have paid τὰ δίδραχμα to thoſe who collected it, not far from *Capernaum*. And then ſuppoſing them to have been obliged to

to carry this Tribute to the Temple, yet there was no neceſſity of their uſing a κολλυβιστὴς to pay a *quarter of an ounce* of Silver. But it is certain that all the Males among the *Jews* were bound by the Law thrice a year to go up to the Temple, *Exod.* xxiii. 17. And becauſe the richer ſort did not uſe to go thither without offering Sacrifices, and being at great Expences, the aſſiſtance of the *Mony-changers* was needful to furniſh them for thoſe Expences. Chapter XXII.

Verſ. 25. *Note* e.] I know that the *Rabbins* uſed to reckon the word שמים *Heaven* amongſt the Names of God: but they abuſe the word שם *Name*; for tho *Heaven* is often ſet to ſignify *God* who dwells in Heaven, not only in *Hebrew*, but alſo in other Languages, yet none beſides the *Rabbins*, ever ſaid that this is one of God's *Names*. Tho a *City* is often taken for the Townſmen or Citizens in it, yet no body would ſay that that word is one of the Citizens *Titles*; as for inſtance, that the Inhabitants of *Athens* were called the *Athenian Citizens* and the *Athenian City*. Every body knows that it is a συνεκδοχὴ λέξις, a *Synechdoche*, whereby the *Container* is put for the thing *contained*.

Verſ. 41. Κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει.] This Phraſe has ſomething proverbial in it in the *Greek* Language, in which an Adverb is elegantly join'd with a Noun that is of a near affinity with it. *Ariſtophanes* in *Pluto* has this very Phraſe ἐπὶ σ' ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς. This could not be expreſſed the ſame way in the *Syrian* and *Chaldee* Dialect, but only by אובדא יובד *in deſtroying he will deſtroy*.

CHAP. XXII.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. I Do not think that it can be gathered from this Parable, that whoever was invited to a Feaſt and did not come *finely enough clothed*, was therefore thruſt out; for who could be ſo inhuman to a Perſon that he knew and had invited? Parables ought not to be ſo ſtrained, as if all that is related in them, uſed *really* to be done. And I am ſure *Juvenal* Sat. v. ver. 131. repreſents to us a poor Man with a *ragged Gown*, as one of the Gueſts at a rich Mans Feaſt.

Quis veſtrum temerarius uſque adeo, quis
Perditus, ut dicat Regi, bibe? Plurima ſunt quæ
Non audent homines, pertusâ, dicere, læna.

About the *Garments uſed at Feaſts* conſult *Oſ. Ferrarius de Re Veſt.* Part 2. l. 1. cap. ix, & xi.

Chapter XXII.

Verſ. 14. Πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ] See what has been ſaid already upon *Chap.* xx. 16. In that place the *called* refers only to the *Jews*, but in this it reſpects alſo the *Gentiles*; for this *ſaying* muſt be underſtood as well of thoſe who came to the Supper out of the *croſs Streets and High-ways*, as thoſe who were *firſt invited*. The meaning is; *God* calls a great many both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, but few anſwering, as they ought, his Call, are *choſen* or *ſet apart* by him to be his peculiar People. So this place is interpreted by *Barnabas*, who was an Apoſtolical Perſon, *Chap.* iii. *Attendite ne quando quieſcentes jam vocati addormiamus in peccatis noſtris, & nequam accipiens poteſtatem noſtrum ſuſcitet & excludat a Regno Domini*, i. e. leſt the ὁ πονηρὸς that wicked one the Devil, as the *Miniſter* of *God's* Diſpleaſure, getting us in his power, caſt us out of the Feaſt. And a little after he ſays, *Attendamus ergo ne forte ſicut ſcriptum eſt, multi vocati, pauci electi inveniamur. Let us therefore take heed leſt haply that ſaying of the Scripture prove true of us*, Many are called but few are choſen.

Verſ. 16. *Note* b] Our learned *Author's* Memory has fail'd him as to ſome things in this place, which I ſhall briefly take notice of.

I. In his Paraphraſe, he deſcribes the *Herodians* thus, *Others that adhered to* Herod *the Roman Governor*: in which words who would not think that he affirmed *Herod* to have been a *Roman* ſent by *Tiberius* to govern *Judæa*? than which nothing can be imagined more abſurd; neither can I conceive that a Man ſo learned as he could ever be guilty of ſo groſs a Miſtake. And therefore I rather think that it was his deſign to ſay, *Thoſe that adhered to the Roman Government*, as Herod. See his Note upon *Chap.* xvi. 6. *Herodes Antipas*, who lived in thoſe times, and was in favor with *Tiberius*, was the *Tetrarch* of *Galilee*, not of *Judæa*, of which *Pontius Pilate* was Procurator.

II. I do not ſee what uſe the *Doctor* could make of the *Syriack* Interpreter, who does not read *Herod's Followers*, but עם רבית הרורם *the People of* Herod's *Houſe*, λαὸς τῦ Ἡρῴδ, *Herod's Domeſticks*: What he ſays afterwards does not concern *Herod*. I am apt to think that the Reaſon why the *Sadduces* are called *Herodians*, was becauſe *Herod* the Great was known to be a *Sadduce*, not becauſe *ſome part* of the *Sadduces* were called by that Name.

III. I wonder that our Author ſhould think all thoſe things which he ſays in his Paraphraſe, to have been implied in that Queſtion of our Saviour's, *Whoſe is this Image and Superſcription?* We ſhould read about this matter the learned Diſcourſe of *M Freberus de Numiſmate Cenſûs*, where we ſhall find all theſe things more accurately handled, and better diſcuſſed than they are here by the *Doctor*.

IV. *Chriſt's*

IV. *Christ*'s Answer, if throughly considered, will be found to have nothing in it that respects the *dueness* of the Tribute; he only warns the *Pharisees* that they had no ground for their thinking it to be a Sin against *God* to pay *Cæsar* the Tax imposed on them, because the rendering of a piece of Mony to *Cæsar* which had his Image impressed upon it, was no wise inconsistent with the strict and due Observation of the *Jewish* Religion. And all that we can gather from this is, that it was *lawful* to pay Tribute, not that the Tribute was justly *imposed*, which was not the thing enquired into. Our *Author* has several things upon this occasion that do not at all belong to this place, which I do not intend in these παρεκπίπτοντα, or short Remarks, to examin. Chapter XXII.

Vers. 20. *Note* c.] It might as well be one of *Tiberius*'s *Denarii* as *Augustus*'s, nor was it necessary that it should have the year wherein *Judæa* was subdued inscribed upon it. The *Denarius* that was required to be paid, was only such a one as had on it the Image of *Augustus* or *Tiberius*. See *M. Freherus*, whom I before mentioned.

Vers. 31. *Note* d.] There are several things both in our *Author*'s Paraphrase upon the Objection of the *Sadducees*, and in his Annotation upon this place, that need Correction.

I. *Moses* does not say, as the *Doctor* represents him at the 24*th* Verse, that the Children of the Person who raises up Seed to his Brother, should be accounted his dead Brother's Children, but only the *first-born*. See *Deut.* xxv. 6.

II. What he says about the Doctrine of the *Sadducees* is very true, as appears from *Acts* xxiii. 6. but his supposing that the *Sadducees* Objection was designed as a Confirmation of their *whole* Doctrine, is without any ground. Their words oppose only the Resurrection of the Body, for they knew well enough that marrying was a thing which respected only the Body, and had no place at all among separate Souls.

III. The word ἀνάστασις was never used in *Scripture* to signify any thing but the *Resurrection of the dead*, i. e. of Men whose Bodies were destroy'd; and which being raised, *Men* are said to be raised, because the Nature of Man consists in the conjunction of Soul and Body. Ἀνίστημι, when this is the thing spoken of, never signifies any thing but *to rise* or *to rise again*. In this sense it is used by *Achilles* in *Homer* Iliad. φ. 56. where he speaks of the *Trojans* that he had killed.

Ἦ μάλα δὴ Τρῶες μεγαλήτορες, ὅσσοι ὕπερθεν
Αὖτις ἀναστήσοντες ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος.

The

Chapter XXII.

The valiant Trojans whom I have kill'd, will certainly riſe again out of obſcure Darkneſs. Tho St. *Paul* uſes the word ἐγείρειν where the *Septuagint* have διαπεφῦν, it does not follow that theſe words ſignify the ſame thing, but rather that St. *Paul* and the *Septuagint* rendered the Hebrew word differently. Tho therefore, abſolutely ſpeaking, ἀνάστασις may be called δευτέρα σύστασις, *a ſecond State* or *Subſiſtence*; yet ſince it is never met with in that ſenſe, it muſt according to its conſtant uſe be underſtood of a thing that is *fallen* and then *raiſed up* again. Πτῶσις & ἀνάστασις are, as the *Logicians* ſpeak, in this caſe *Correlates*. See 2 *Maccab.* xii. 43, 44. This word was ſo very commonly uſed in that ſenſe, that even when it is put *alone* it ſignifies the Reſurrection of the Body. It is a miſtake alſo that the words τῶν νεκρῶν in this Phraſe ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν are of the *Neuter* Gender, the Subſtantive ἀνθρώπων being to be underſtood, as appears from ſeveral places where the νεκροὶ are ſaid to be raiſed up, as in *Mat.* x. 8. and xi. 5. *Luke* xx. 37. *Joh.* v. 21. 1 *Cor.* xv. 15, 16, &c. Our Author's reaſonings againſt the perpetual uſe of the word are not to be regarded. The place which he cites out of *Luke* xiv. 14. may moſt fitly be underſtood of *the Reſurrection of the Body*, as being the principal Reward which is oppoſed to the Rewards of this Life.

IV. Laſtly, That the force of *Chriſt*'s reaſoning, *ver.* 32. might be diſcerned, he puts in as a ſupply to it in his Paraphraſe upon that Verſe, the words μετὰ τὸν τελευτὴν αὐτῶν: *it was ſpoken by God, I am the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *after their death.* I had rather infer it from the import of the Phraſe, *I am the God of* Abraham, *&c.* conſidered in it ſelf, whereby God dos not only ſignify that he had bin in time paſt the *Object* of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*'s Worſhip, but that he had had a peculiar *kindneſs* for them which he *ſtill* retain'd; but now the *dead*, that is, thoſe that are *eternally* dead, cannot be ſaid to be the Objects of *God*'s Favour or Kindneſs, but only thoſe whoſe Souls live with him after Death, and whoſe Bodies alſo are to be raiſed. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xvii. 8.

Verſ. 37. Ἀγαπήσεις κύριον.] Tho the *Love of God* is often ſet to ſignify the whole Duty which we owe to him, both the Duties of the firſt and ſecond Table; yet it being in this place diſtinguiſhed from the *Love of our Neighbour*, I am apt to think that by that great Commandment we are only to underſtand the Worſhip of the *one* true God, whom we may be ſaid to worſhip with all our Heart, with all our Soul, and with all our Mind, when we worſhip him alone and not any *other*. For thoſe that worſhip more *Gods* than one, worſhip none at all with their whole Soul, but divide, as it were, their Minds between

tween many. This ſeems to be the proper meaning of this Phraſe, which is ſo much *diverſified* to ſignify the higheſt *Affection* and *Intention* of the Soul in Divine Worſhip. See *Deut.* vi. 5. and my Notes upon that place. Chapter XXIII.

Verſ. 40. *Note* f.] It is a Metaphor taken from thoſe things which are hung upon a *Nail* or *Peg*, which ſticking faſt to the Wall, whatever hangs upon it is firm and ſecure, and it cannot be plucked out but all tumbles down at once. And ſo as long as theſe two things, *the Worſhiping of God alone*, and *the loving our Neighbour as our ſelves*, ſtand firm, Religion and Probity are ſafe; but theſe being once looſened and removed out of the Soul, all Probity and Religion are at the ſame time rooted out. There is the ſame Metaphor uſed in all the places which the *Doctor* quotes, tho their ſenſe be various, and he does not rightly compare or apply them. The proper ſignification of the Phraſe being thus once ſuggeſted, it will be eaſy, if we have but a regard to the thing ſpoken of, to put a fitter Interpretation upon them. *Grotius* tells us he is of their Opinion who think this to be a Latin Phraſe, of which kind there are many in the Books of the New Teſtament. But that he is miſtaken, will appear by this Paſſage in *Plato* lib. x. *de Legibus*, at the beginning, where after he had ſaid that there ought to be a Law made againſt Violence, that no body might take away what was another Man's, againſt the Owner's conſent, he adds: ἐκ γὰρ δὴ τῶν τοίτων πάντα ἀκήκοα τάδε εἰρημένα καὶ γίγνεται, καὶ ἔσται, καὶ ἔσται: *for upon this all the Evils which I have mentioned, have hanged, do hang, and will hang.*

CHAP. XXIII.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. Concerning theſe *Phylacteries*, ſee my Notes upon *Exod.* xiii. 9. where I have confirm'd what the *Doctor* ſays.

Verſ. 15. Περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν.] So zealous were the Jews to make Proſelytes to their Law, that it became almoſt a Proverb among the Romans, as we may ſee by *Horace*, who in the ivth Sat. of his *Lib.* 1. after he had ſaid that he ſometimes made Verſes, and that ought to be excuſed in him, becauſe it was but a ſmall fault, concludes thus;

——— *Cui ſi concedere nolis*
Multa Poetarum veniet manus, auxilio quæ
Sit mihi, nam multo plures ſumus, ac veluti te
JUDÆI, cogemur in hanc concedere turbam.

Verſ.

Chapter XXIII.

Verſ. 22. Ὀμνύει ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ] This form of ſwearing the *Jews* uſed in imitation of the *Heathens*, amongſt whom nothing was more common in ordinary diſcourſe than to ſay τὸν ἐνοικοῦντα, as ſufficiently appears from *Ariſtophanes*. And this Oath was uſed by the *Heathens* either becauſe they thought Heaven it ſelf to be a Deity, or elſe underſtood by Heaven ἐνοικοῦντας, *the Gods that dwelt in Heaven*. But the *Jews* who charged the Heathen with folly and lightneſs in their Oaths, thought that they themſelves might uſe that form of ſwearing. And hereupon *Chriſt* teaches them, that whenever they ſwore in that form of words, *by Heaven*, it was as if they ſwore by the true God himſelf, who dwells in a peculiar manner in Heaven. So *Achilles* in *Homer* Iliad. A, *v.* 214. ſwearing by his Scepter, the *Scholiaſt* obſerves that at the ſame time he ſwore by *God*: ἰσέον Ν, ſays he, ὅτι δὲ σκήπτρῳ ὄμνυσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείας Θεόν: *It muſt be obſerved that in ſwearing by his Scepter, he ſwears by God himſelf who rules over Kingdoms.* The reaſon of which is, becauſe the Scepter is an Enſign of Kingly Power. And therefore he did but diſcover his Ignorance, whoever he was, that ridiculed this Oath, by ſaying,

———*Sceptrum non putat eſſe Deos.*

Verſ. 27. *Note* h.] The *Doctor* contradicts himſelf, while he endeavours to reconcile St. *Luke* and St. *Matthew*: For he tells us that the Sepulchres were called κεκονιαμένα τάφοι, becauſe they were grown over with Graſs, and ſo were ἄδηλα *undiſtinguiſhable* from other ground. And yet in the mean while he affirms that they were *whited over with Lime* on purpoſe that they might be *diſtinguiſhed*; whereas on the one hand, as Lime hinders the growing of Graſs, ſo on the other, it was impoſſible that they ſhould at the ſame time be ἄδηλα becauſe of their being covered with Graſs, and yet κεκονιαμένα by the ground's being daub'd with Lime. We had better therefore ſay, that *Chriſt* made uſe of both theſe Compariſons in the ſame Diſcourſe, and ſpake in ſome ſuch manner as this. " Wo unto you Scribes and Phariſees, Hypo-
" crites, for ye are like to Sepulchres, which are whited over that
" they may be diſtinguiſhed from other ordinary ground, and which
" indeed appear outwardly clean and beautiful, but are within un-
" clean, becauſe of the dead Bodies that lie in them: or ye are like
" alſo to Sepulchres which are covered with Graſs, which cannot be
" diſcerned from the plain ground, and yet pollute thoſe that go
" over them. The *former* ſort appeared fair by their being *whited*, theſe *latter* becauſe of the *Graſs* that grew upon them. The cuſtom of

of whiting Sepulchres has been ſhewn likewiſe out of the Talmudical Writers, by Dr. *Lightfoot* upon this place of St. *Matthew*. Chapter XXIII.

Verſ. 35. Πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον, &c.] A Thief who ſhould ſee his Father ſuffer for the ſame Crime, and yet ſhould not forbear robbing and ſtealing, would undoubtedly be much worſe than he, and deſerve a more ſevere Puniſhment, becauſe no warning or example would reform him. And therefore when he came to ſuffer for his own Crimes, it would be but juſtice that he ſhould bear, in the firſt place, what his Father ſuffered; and then as an addition to his Puniſhment, that which he deſerved more than his Father, by being worſe than he. And in this reſpect he might be ſaid to bear his Father's and his own Puniſhments. And thus thoſe Murderers the *Jews*, who were very ſenſible that the Scripture denounced a moſt heavy Puniſhment upon ſuch as committed Murder, and knew that a great many that were guilty of that Sin had been ſeverely puniſhed both by *God* and Man, did not only deſerve to ſuffer what thoſe ſuffered who had before been guilty of that Crime, and by whoſe Example they ought to have been deterred from doing the like, but as much as *all* thoſe Murderers had endured, whom they knew had been condemned and puniſhed for committing Murder. Conſult *H. Grotius* upon *Chap.* xxvii. 27.

Ibid. in *Note* i.] After theſe words, *the Name of* Jehojada *for this of* Barachiah] See Note on *Chap.* xiii. 35. where there is ſuch another Example of a Name leſs known being changed into one more known.

Ibid. after *Note* i.] Among the ſeveral Opinions ſet down by the *Doctor*, the moſt probable by far is that wherein *Chriſt* is ſuppoſed to have had a reſpect to 2 *Chron.* xxiv. That *Zachariah* who is there ſpoken of is very fitly put to anſwer *Abel*; becauſe as *Abel* was the firſt of thoſe righteous Perſons, whoſe Murder the Scripture gives us an account of, ſo *Zachariah* the Son of *Jehojada*, or *Barachiah*, was the laſt of the Prophets whoſe Murder is recorded in the Old Teſtament. And therefore the *ſecond Objection* which our *Author* mentions againſt this Opinion is plainly of no force: as for the *reſt*, they are ſufficiently anſwered by himſelf.

For my own part, I cannot by any means digeſt that laſt Interpretation to which the *Doctor* gives the preference. For of the Sins that the *Jews* would afterwards be guilty of in this kind, *Chriſt* had ſpoken before in the future Tenſe: *Ye ſhall kill and ye ſhall crucify*, ſays he, *and ye ſhall ſcourge and perſecute*; and then it follows: *That upon you may come all the righteous Blood ſhed upon the Earth, from the Blood of*

Chapter XXIV. *righteous* Abel, *&c.* whence it is plain that all the Murders mentioned in this Verſe (the number whereof *Chriſt* ſays in the Verſe before, the Jews would afterwards augment) were already paſt. If I might be allowed to make a Conjecture, that which here biaſſed the *Doctor* was his deſire of finding an Example to confirm what he ſays about *Antipas* in his *Premon.* to the *Revelations*, of which in its proper place.

Ibid. *Note* k.] 'Tis through a miſtake ſaid by our Author, that the *High-prieſt* proſtrated himſelf *before the door of the Porch*; for there was no door in that place but the door of the Sanctuary it ſelf, which had a Veil drawn before it. The Porch facing the Prieſt's Court was all open, and was only ſurrounded with Pillars. See *Joſephus*, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. 1. c. 14.

CHAP. XXIV.

Verſ. 3. *Note* b. IT had been better if our learned Author had omitted his Compariſon between *Veſpaſian* and *Chriſt*, wherein he is both too nice, and not ſo exact as he ſhould be, as will appear by theſe following Ramarks. I. Who can bear to have the Predictions of the *Prophets* concerning the future Reign of Chriſt, compared to a Prediction of flattering *Joſephus*, or to meer uncertain Surmiſes? II. The place the *Doctor* refers to in *Suetonius*, in the ſecond part of the Compariſon, is this. *Cænante bos arator decuſſo jugo, Triclinium irrupit; ac fugatis miniſtris, quaſi repente deſeſſus, procidit ad ipſos accumbentis pedes, cervicemq; ſubmiſit:* i. e. as he abbreviates him, *an Ox brake in, and fell down at* Veſpaſian's *feet*, as an Omen of his becoming Emperor. But all that is ſaid by St. *Luke* of *Chriſt*, is that he was *born in a manger, and wrapped in ſwadling clothes*; as to any *Beaſts* being with him in the Stable, or *falling down* before him, he is altogether ſilent, nor had the *Doctor* any good Authority for his aſſerting it. III. I confeſs *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* do give us that account of *Veſpaſian's* Miracles of which the *Doctor* ſpeaks; but that what they tell us was real matter of Fact, is not ſufficiently clear: for what aſſurance can any Man give us, that ſome vain fellows among the *Egyptians* did not make it their buſineſs to flatter *Veſpaſian*, or that he himſelf being a *Politick* Man did not ſeek ſuch an occaſion to gain the favour of the ſuperſtitious multitude, at his entrance upon the Government? or elſe it may be it was an invention of *Idolaters* to oppugn Chriſtianity, by making people believe that *Chriſt* was not the *only* Perſon that had healed the *blind with Spittle*; and it was dangerous for

for any man to go about to detect a Cheat which was countenanced by the Emperor. IV. I cannot imagin where the *Doctor* read in *Suetonius* that *Vespasian* was *Humillimus & Clementissimus*; for these words are not to be found in the Life of *Vespasian*. He says indeed in Chap. xii. *Principatus ad ultimum civilis & clemens*; but he never calls him *humilis*, which amongst the *Latins* is a Reproach, and not the name of a Vertue. 'Tis only *Ecclesiastical Writers* who call that *Humilitas* which the old *Latins* call *Modestia*. *Humilis* with these signifies one of the common sort of People, a poor mean-spirited person, as I need not prove. V. I wish our *Author* had set down the place out of *Josephus* which made him think that he believed *Vespasian* to be the *Messias*. For it is possible, I confess, he might foretel that he should be *Emperor*, by misconstruing in his favour an antient and settled Opinion, famous throughout all the eastern parts, that the Fates had decreed, that there should come out of *Judea* at that time, those who should govern the World; but he never said nor could say that he was the *Messias*, i. e. the Deliverer of the *Jews*. And the same I say of his attributing afterwards the same Opinion to the other *Jews*: for tho some few of them might perhaps accommodate some Prophecies which were before thought to belong to the *Messias*, to *Vespasian*; yet it was impossible they should take one who almost extinguished the very *Jewish* name, for the *Deliverer* of their Nation.

Chapter XXIV.

I could find as many faults also with the *Doctor*'s next Collection of Parallels, which are but manifest Niceties. I. What tolerable agreement is there, for instance, between what *Isaiah* says of *John the Baptist*, and the levelling of the High-ways for the coming of the *Roman Engines?* II. It is false, that it was at the approach of the *Balistæ* that the Jews cried out *filius venit, the Son cometh*, as our Author says. The Story according to the Distinction made in the *Latin* Translation, is in *cap.* 7. *lib.* 6. of *Josephus*, but in the *Greek* in *cap.* 18. That Cry was made from the Watch-towers of the *Jews*, when the *Stones* were flung out of the Engines. *Josephus*'s words are these: Σκοποὶ ὧν αὐτῶν ἔδει τὴν πύργων κεκλεῖσθαι φερομένων ὁπότων χαλάση τὸ ὄργανον, ἢ πέτρα φέροιτο, τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ βοῶντες, ὁ υἱὸς ἔρχεται: *The Spies sitting upon the towers gave them notice before-hand when the Engine opened and a Stone was coming, crying out in their mother-tongue, the Son cometh.* Which I take, nevertheless, to be a mistake in *Josephus*, who standing without, did not distinguish the word אבן *eben*, which signifies a *Stone*, from הבן *habben* a *Son*; for without doubt they cried, when the Stone was flung out, אבן בא *the Stone cometh*, not הבן בא *the Son cometh*. And if this be true, then this part of the parallel is quite

 spoiled.

Chapter XXIV.

ſpoiled. Our learned *Author* ſeems not to have looked into *Joſephus* when he wrote theſe things, or rather when he copied them out of ſome other book; as appears partly by the place alledged, and partly by the *Chapters* in *Joſephus* not being always rightly referred to, but ſometimes according to the diviſion in the *Greek*, and other times in the *Latin*.

However, it is moſt certain that the *Jews* themſelves acknowledged that deſtruction to have been brought upon them by *God*, and this is more than once obſerved by *Joſephus* in his 6 and 7 *Books* of the *Jewiſh* War. See *Lib.* vi. *Cap.* ii. and *Cap.* xi. in the *Latin*, and *Lib.* vii. *Cap.* xvi. And *Titus* thought the ſame, who after he had viewed the fortifications of the City, νῦν δὲ θεῷ γ' ἐπολεμήσαμεν, ἔφη, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων πύργους ἐξελών, ἐπεὶ χώρις τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἢ μηχανὰς, τί πρὸς τούτους τοὺς πύργους ἴσχυεν; *We have fought, ſaid he, with the aſſiſtance of God, and it was God who diſpoſſeſſed the Jews of thoſe ſtrong holds. For what human force, or engins could ſignify any thing againſt thoſe Towers?* Lib. vii. c. 16.

Verſ. 3. *Note* c.] The Phraſe αἰῶνος συντέλεια cannot be underſtood unleſs we firſt know the juſt import of the word αἰὼν. Now that word ſeems to ſignify properly and primarily *Eternity*, for it comes from ἀεὶ *always*, and αἰώνιος ſignifies *eternal*. Afterwards it was uſed in a figurative ſenſe to ſignify as long a duration as could agree to the thing ſpoken of, whence the time of *mans life* was called αἰὼν, as in Latin *ævum*. The Diſcourſe here cannot be about *Eternity*, which has no συντέλεια *conſummation*, or end; nor is it about the time of *mans life*, but about the ſpace of time during which God had determined to preſerve the Temple and *Jeruſalem*, as our *Author* has beſt of all obſerved. So that if we conſider only the ſeries of the Diſcourſe, this Phraſe συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος will be Elliptical, and the words ἐν ᾧ ἦν τὸ ἱερὸν ἱδρυθαι, *in which the Temple was to ſtand*, muſt be underſtood. But becauſe the duration of the World is ſometimes taken for the *World* it ſelf, therefore αἰὼν and αἰῶνες alſo in *Greek*, and *Sæcula* amongſt the *Latins*, do now and then ſignify the World it ſelf. The ſame may be ſaid of the Hebrew עולם *holam*, as learned Men have long ago obſerved. For which reaſon we uſe to interpret that word in the writings of the *Rabbins* ſometimes *Eternity*, ſometimes any long ſpace of time during which a thing laſts, whatſoever it be, and ſometimes the World it ſelf. It is plain, that in the place cited out of the Book of *Tobit*, αἰὼν ſignifies both that determinate ſpace of time during which the Temple was to continue, and alſo the whole duration of the World. For firſt *Tobit* ſays that they ſhould build a Temple, but not ſuch a one as the firſt, which ſhould continue ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος *till the*

times

times of the duration (viz. of the Temple) were accomplished. Then he says that there should be afterwards εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος οἰκοδομὴ ἐνδοξος, a structure that should be famous throughout all the ages of the world. Hence, by most Interpreters, the Phrase συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος in this place of St. *Matthew*, is understood of *the end of the world*. They tell us that the Apostles ask'd *Christ* first, when the Temple was to be destroyed, and then what were to be the signs of his coming, and so of the end of the World? It being undeniable that the word αἰὼν is ambiguous, *Christ*'s answers must be ambiguous too; some of his expressions agreeing best to the *destruction* of the *Jews*, as Dr. *Hammond* has extraordinarily well shewed, and others more properly describing the Conclusion of the *World* it self. I like Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion best; which yet may in some measure be reconciled with the other, if we do but suppose the Destruction of the *Jews* to have been designed as a faint Representation of the end of the World, as our *Author* likewise thinks in his Paraphrase upon *Ch.* xxv. And so this Prophecy will be just of the same kind with those Old Testament Predictions which were so worded as to respect some greater event than that which was expressly and plainly foretold in them; of which see *Grotius* upon *Matt.* i. 22. Chapter XXIV.

Vers. 7. *Note* e.] Our *Author*'s Remarks upon the word ἔθνη are indeed true, which is often used to signify, not the Nations belonging to several Commonwealths, and which were of different originals; but the Inhabitants of various Tracts or Territories, notwithstanding they were Members of the same *Commonwealth*, and of the same *Lineage*, such as were the several Tribes of the *Jews*. See my Notes on *Gen.* xlix. 10. upon the word *People*. But yet there *really* were in *Judea* it self very sharp Contentions between *different Nations*, viz. the *Jews* and *Syrians*, which are treated of by *Josephus* in lib. ii. cap. xix. in Latin, *de Bello Judaico*.

Vers. 11. Ψευδοπροφῆται.] *Grotius* thinks that the persons here intended were the ill Interpreters of the Law; and indeed, as *Cicero* lib. i. *de Divin.* says, *Oraculorum interpretes, ut Grammatici Poetarum, proxime ad eorum quos interpretantur divinationem videntur accedere. The Interpreters of Oracles, as Grammarians are to Poets, seem to be near akin to the Diviners themselves which they interpret.*

Vers. 17. *Note* h.] *Cæsarius* was in a mistake; for as *Josephus* lib. vii. *Bell. Jud.* cap. xvi. and xviii. *Lat.* informs us, *Jerusalem* was taken on the *eighth day of September*, i. e. in the beginning of Autumn. And his description likewise of the Slaughter has more Rhetorick than Truth in it.

Vers.

Chapter XXV.

Verſ. 19. Οὐαὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις.] *Namely*, becauſe they could not eaſily *fly away*, which is the caſe likewiſe of thoſe that have ſucking infants or little children. To this purpoſe are the words of *Silius Italicus*, *Punic.* lib. iv. where he deſcribes the flight of the *Romans* upon the approach of *Hannibal*'s Army:

——— *Tum crine ſoluto,*
Ante agitur conjux, dextrâ, lævaque trahuntur
Parvi non æquo comitantes ordine nati.

Verſ. 22. *Note* k.] By the ἐκλεκτοὶ here are meant *Chriſtians*, as alſo in the places where they are ſet in oppoſition to the κλητοὶ *called*, as chap. xx. 16. See the Notes upon that place.

Verſ. 26. *Note* l.] Ταμεῖα are properly the *inner rooms* or *chambers* of the houſe; and it being uſual to hide thoſe things which we would have ſafely kept in ſuch private places, whenever a Commonwealth is ſpoken of, it ſignifies a *Treaſury*; and whenever a Family is ſpoken of, a *Storehouſe*. So the *Old Gloſſaries*. Ταμεῖον τὸ δημόσιον, *fiſcus, ærarium, the publick Treaſury*. Ταμεῖον τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν, *Cellarium, Cella, a private Storehouſe or Cellar*, &c. In this place it muſt be taken in the firſt ſignification, for an *inner room*, or that part of the houſe into which perſons uſe to retire who are deſirous of being private. It is not probable that there ſhould be a reſpect here had to *a fortified City*, in which there are no more ταμεῖα or places for men to *conceal* themſelves in, than in *others*; but only to a ſecret place in ſome houſe where the *Meſſias* might be ſaid to lie hid. See the *Septuagint* in *Gen.* xliii. 30. and *Exod.* viii. 3. The word ταμεῖον is put in oppoſition to open places, ſuch as is a Deſert; and *Chriſt*'s meaning is nothing but this, that there ſhould be no Deliverer to be found either without doors or within. See *Deut.* xxxii. 25.

CHAP. XXV.

Verſ. 1. Τοῦ νυμφίου.] *Grotius* has obſerved that the *Syriack* and *Latin* add here καὶ τῆς νύμφης; and ſo does alſo the *Cambridg* Greek and Latin Copy.

Verſ. 4. Ἔλαιον ἐλαίου.] There is not ſuch a perfect *decorum* kept in Parables, as I have already obſerved elſewhere, as that every thing in them is an alluſion to what was generally practiſed. This appears ſufficiently from this place; for thoſe that uſed Lamps, did not for *one* night, beſides the oil that was in their Lamps, carry oil in

another

another veſſel, with which they might ſupply their Lamp that ſame night; but they filled their Lamp *once* for the whole night. But it is ſufficient if what is ſaid in Parables be not impoſſible, and there be a fitneſs in them to expreſs the mind of the perſon that uſes them. Chapter XXV.

Verſ. 9. Μήποτε.] The words ἐ δώσωμεν, or ſome other ſuch, muſt be underſtood, and ſupplied thus; ἐ δώσωμεν μήποτε. An *Ellipſis* before the Particle פֶּן *leſt that*, is very common among the *Hebrews*.

Verſ. 14. Τοὺς δούλους.] By δούλους here I am apt to think we muſt underſtand thoſe which the *Romans* called *Liberti*, rather than *Servi*, or at leaſt Hirelings who were at their own diſpoſal. See my Note upon Chap. xviii. 23. To this agrees the Saying of *Trimalchio* in *Petronius*; *Poſtquam cœpi plus habere quam tota patria mea habet, manum de tabula, ſuſtuli me de negotiatione, & cœpi libertos fœnerare. After I had once gotten more than all my kindred put together, I threw by my Accounts, left off my Trade, and began to put out my money to ſuch as had ſerved for their freedom, upon Uſury.*

Verſ. 15. Κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν.] Εἰς τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι muſt here be underſtood, *that he might traffick to the beſt of his ability*. Each Servant had a certain ſum given him by the Maſter of the Family, that he might trade proportionably to the ſum which he received, and according to the degree of his Prudence: for there are ſome that can manage prudently a great ſum, and are fit to engage in much buſineſs, and there are others whoſe ability is leſs, and muſt have leſs employment given them. This has a *myſtical* ſenſe in it, and ſignifies that ſome have received more light and gifts from *God* than others; and that every one muſt give an account according to his Receipts. This is more natural than what is ſaid by *Grotius*; and is the ſenſe that Dr. *Hammond* puts upon it in his Paraphraſe.

Verſ. 21. Εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ Κυρίου σ.] I cannot imagin what our Author's thoughts were taken up with, when he wrote his Paraphraſe upon theſe words, for it has no agreement at all with the words of *Chriſt*. The word χαρὰ here ſignifies a Feaſt, to which a Patron uſually invited his *Libertus* or *Client*, upon his having well executed his Orders. The *Septuagint*, in *Eſther* ix. 19. render the Hebrew מִשְׁתֶּה *a feaſt*, by χαρὰν. And it is no wonder that things which do ſo often accompany one another, as *joy* and *a feaſt*, are ſometimes promiſcuouſly uſed. That the *Liberti* uſed to lie down at meat with their *Patrons*, a Privilege not granted to the *Servi* by their Maſters, is notorious. *Demetrius* the *Libertus* of *Pompey* the Great, is particularly branded for his inſolence in lying down before his *Patron*. The Patron therefore here in this part of the Parable, is repreſented as ordering

Chapter XXVI.

ordering his *Libertus* or *Client* to come into the Dining-room that he might partake of his Feast.

Verſ. 24. Σκληρὸς ἦ ἀνθρωπος.] In this part of the Parable there is no *decorum* at all obſerved; for no Servant or Client would dare to ſpeak at this rate to his Maſter or Patron. But, as I ſaid before, this is not neceſſary in a Parable; and theſe words are very fitly made uſe of to repreſent to us the idle Excuſes that bad Servants are apt to alledg in their own behalf. However, it muſt be obſerved alſo, that this part of the Parable is but as the πλήρωμα, or that which ſerves to *fill up* in a *Picture*; for there is nothing to anſwer it in the ἀνάδοσις or myſtical ſenſe. All that *Chriſt* meant by it is, that no Excuſe will be admitted for thoſe who do not make a good uſe of the favours they have received.

Verſ. 29. Ὁ ἔχει.] See my Notes upon *Chap.* xiii. 12.

Verſ. 30. Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.] I wonder that our learned *Author* ſhould interpret this Expreſſion *outer darkneſs* of the darkneſs of a *Dungeon*, which ſhould rather be called τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐνδότερον, *inner darkneſs*. I have explained this Phraſe already in a Note on *Ch.* viii. 12. where the diſcourſe, as it is here, is about men excluded from the *Feaſt*, and caſt out of the houſe where it was kept.

Verſ. 34. Ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.] Our *Author* very improperly paraphraſes theſe words *before all eternity*; as if any thing could be prior to *eternity*. This is what I had to obſerve on this Chapter, to which the *Doctor* has ſaid nothing. And I have only touched on thoſe things which others have wholly paſſed by, referring the Reader for a more full Interpretation of it to *Grotius*.

CHAP. XXVI.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b.

I Don't believe that *that* is the true original of the word ἀλάβαστρον which the *Greek Grammarians*, who are very notable men at inventing trifling Etymologies, give us of it; for if it were, that ſort of veſſel would rather have been called ἄλαβον or ἀλαβὶς, than with ſo little regard had to the analogy of the derivation, ἀλάβαστρον. Beſides, if that veſſel had been ſo called, becauſe it had no λαβάς *handles*, it ought to have been ſaid *adjectively* ἀλάβαστρον, *whatever is deſtitute of handles*, (which yet the Greek Language will not admit of) whence a particular ſort of veſſels were afterwards called κατ' ἐξοχὴν Ἀλάβαστρα. If the words were to be derived from a *Greek* original, I ſhould rather deduce it, with *Salmaſius*, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβάλλω *imponere*, and ſo make ἀναβάστρον to be an *Atticiſm* for ἀνάβαστρον. See *Salmaſ.* on *Ch.* xiii. of *Solinus*. But the *true* original of the word is certainly from

from that ſort of *Marble* which was called Alabaſter, of which thoſe Veſſels that bore that name were commonly made. For to ſay that Marble was *ſo* called, becauſe out of that were formed Veſſels *without handles*, as the *Doctor* and *Salmaſ.* himſelf does, is abſurd; ſince not only Veſſels of all ſhapes and forms, but even Pillars alſo were made out of it. 'Tis as if one ſhould ſay, becauſe the word *Onyx* ſometimes ſignifies a Veſſel, therefore that ſort of ſtone was *ſo* called, becauſe it was the matter of which thoſe Veſſels were made. Now as for the word *Alabaſter* it ſelf, it is an *Arabian* name for that kind of Marble, for בצרה *batſraton* is the Noun it ſelf in uſe, which by an addition of the *Arabian* Article אל becomes אלבצרה *albatſraton*, τὸ ἀλάβαστρον. The reaſon why I think it had an *Arabian* name is, not only becauſe the *Arabian* Article אל makes it probable, but becauſe it was cut out of the *Arabian* Mountains, and was firſt brought from thence. So *Pliny* tells us, *Lib.* xxxvi. *C.* 7. *Onychem etiam tum in Arabiæ montibus, nec uſquam aliubi naſci putavere Veteres. The Antients alſo at that time thought that Alabaſter grew in the mountains of Arabia and no where elſe.* And a little after he ſays, *Naſcitur circa Thebas Ægyptias, Damaſcum Syriæ; it grows about Thebes in Egypt, and Damaſcus in Syria.* And there was a City, ſomewhere between the *Nile* and the *Red ſea*, or in *Egyptian Arabia*, called for that reaſon Ἀλάβαστρα, which is mentioned by *Pliny* Lib. v. c. 9. and by *Ptolomy* Lib. iv. c. 5. who places it in the Province of *Cynopolis*, near to which was the *Alabaſter* Mountain mentioned by the ſame Author. So that the *Doctor* finds fault with *If. Caſaubon* unjuſtly, for ſaying that Veſſels not made of Marble were but by a καταχρῆσις, or improperly, called Ἀλάβαστρα.

Chapter XXVI.

Nor can I imagin how a perſon ſo extraordinary well verſed in the Scriptures could deny that this Veſſel was broken by the Woman who poured the Ointment out of it upon *Chriſt*, this being expreſly affirmed by St. *Mark* Chap. xiv. 3. And tho it had *not*, yet our *Authors* reaſon againſt it is of no weight, for what ground had he to think that a little Veſſel made of thin Marble could not eaſily be broken? As for the Reaſon of the Womans breaking the veſſel, that ſeems to be becauſe the mouth of it was ſo narrow that the *Spikenard* which is a thicker ointment than ordinary could not run eaſily enough out of it.

Ibid. *Note* c.] I have ſhewed in a Note on *Matt.* xxv. 21. that χαρὰ there, and ſometimes the *Hebrew* שמחה ſignifies *a feaſt*. The French would ſay *une rejouïſſance*, which tho it does not ſignify properly *a feaſt*, yet never uſes to be made without one. What our Author ſays about the uſe of ointments in Feaſts is very true, but who does

Chapter XXVI.

not know it? He had better only have referred us to ſome *Critick* who had treated upon that Subject. The indignation which *Judas* expreſſed againſt the Woman who poured the oil upon *Chriſt* concealed his covetouſneſs the better, becauſe none but *delicate* or *voluptuous* perſons made uſe of ſuch pretious ointments, and *Chriſt* was a profeſſed enemy to all ſenſual pleaſures. So *Ariſtippus* perceiving that he could not anoint himſelf without incurring peoples cenſures, cried out: *Male iſtis effæminatis eveniat, quia rem tam bellam infamaverunt: A miſchief take thoſe effeminate perſons for bringing ſo good a cuſtom into diſgrace.* See *Diog. Laert.* Lib. ii. S. 76.

Verſ. 26. *Note* e.] I. Concerning the phraſe *the body of the Paſſover* and the like, ſee *Buxtorf in Diſſ. de Inſtit. Cœnæ Domin.* Sect. 25. from whom our *Author* ſeems to have borrowed what he here ſays.

II. The word τοῦτο is not the relative to the *ceremony* or *action*, but only to the *bread*; for who, beſides Dr. *Hammond*, would ever have thus explained *Chriſt*'s words, *This eating and drinking denotes my body?* That learned man did not care how he expreſſed himſelf, provided the skilful Reader could but gueſs his meaning; but the words of Scripture muſt not be forced in that manner. 'Tis *bread*, not a *ceremony*, that is called *the body of Chriſt*; and *eating* and *drinking* are only the ſigns of our ſpiritual *participation* of that body. And it makes nothing againſt this that τοῦτο is of the *neuter* gender, it being uſual in all Languages ſo to demonſtrate any thing whatſoever; and the word πρᾶγμα being always to be underſtood in the *Greek* Language, when the name that belongs to the thing intended is not expreſſed. Beſides, the word τοῦτο may be very well referred to σῶμα, and not to ἄρτος, and yet the ſenſe be the ſame. The words of St. *Luke* are contrary to the *Doctor*'s opinion, for who would ſay, *the eating of bread is the figure of my body?* In the reſt of this *Annot.* our *Author* acts the part of a *Divine* rather than an *Interpreter*, and ſpeaks as if he were making a common place about the *Lords ſupper.*

Verſ. 33. Ἀπειθεῖς ὁ Πέτρος, &c.] It is an old Greek Proverb, θαρρῶν ἀρχὴν ἔργων ἐν πολλῷ κακὸς: *he that undertakes a thing confidently is generally fearful.* And to the ſame purpoſe is that ſaying of *Epicharmus* in the Scholiaſt upon *Homer* at ver. 93. *Iliad* H. Καλὸς θαρσῶν ἀλλ' ἀνιθρὼν ὕστερα φεύγει: *a coward is at firſt very confident of himſelf, and afterwards runs away.* And this was juſt St. *Peter*'s caſe before he had been confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt, upon *Chriſt*'s praying for him.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

Verſ. 5. *Note* a. OUr learned *Author*, that he might be able to reconcile S. *Matthew* with S. *Luke*, follows for the moſt part *D. Heinſius*, who by the word ἀπάγχεσθαι underſtands a *ſuffocation* cauſed by *grief*. But, I. There is no place by any one alledged, wherein the word ἀπάγχεσθαι ſignifies ſuch a *diſeaſe*, eſpecially in *men*; for thoſe which are cited by the *Doctor* are nothing to the purpoſe, as I ſhall preſently ſhew. That word is always taken for ſtrangling with a *Halter*, or ſome other violent way. II. The place alledged out of *Ælian* does not prove that the Verb ἀπάγχεσθαι ſignifies any thing but ſtrangling with a Halter. When he ſays that *Scoffs have not only grieved men, but alſo killed them*; he does not mean that ſome who had been ſcoffed had laid it ſo to heart as to die only with Grief, but that they had been ſo impatient of Deriſion, as to kill themſelves. Thus *Poliager* being jeered *hanged* himſelf, ἀπήγξατο. And ſo *Archilochus*'s Iambicks made *Lycambe* and her Daughters hang themſelves. III. The word in *Chryſoſtom* is ſimply ἄγχεσθαι, which is ſometimes taken metaphorically for the *anguiſh of the mind*, but never a *Suffocation*. Nor does that place ſignify any thing to the buſineſs, as has been well obſerved by the learned *Jac. Gronovius* in his *Diſſ. de Caſu Judæ*; for *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks of *wicked* men, who he tells us at the laſt day, when their Sins ſhall be made publick and manifeſt, will be πνιγόμενοι καὶ ἀγχόμενοι συνειδότι, *ſuffocated and ſtrangled with Conſcience*, which is not the ſame with what is ſaid here of *Judas*. IV. The words ὅτι ἀπάγξασθαι in *Tobit*, ſignify *ſo as to think of hanging her ſelf*, as is plain from what follows; where ſhe is repreſented as blaming her ſelf for entertaining ſuch Thoughts, and ſaying, *I am my fathers only daughter; if I ſhould do this, it would be a reproach*, &c. and a little after, *I ſaid* (*i. e.* I thought, according to the genius of the Hebrew) *that I had beſt free my ſelf from the earth, and hear no more reproaches*; for ſo we ought to render the words εἶπον ἀπολῦσαί με, and not, *I ſaid, free, or take me away*; for it follows, καὶ μὴ ἀκοῦσαί με, which does not ſignify *and do not hear me*, but *I ought not to hear or hearken*. And this, I know not for what reaſon, Dr. *Hammond* has omitted; by which it would have appear'd that the foregoing words were not rightly tranſlated. Let but the place it ſelf be read, and the thing will be plain. V. The Hebrew word מחנק in *Job* vii. 15. is rightly rendered by *Aquila* ἀγχόνη *a halter*, becauſe the thing intended is evidently a *ſqueezing* of the *throat* with a *rope*, as a way of dying: *My*

Chapter XXVII.

ſoul hath choſen ſtrangling, and death rather than my bones; i. e. My grief is ſo great, that I had rather die by ſtrangling, or any other ſort of death, than live. The *Septuagint* neither underſtood *Job*'s meaning, nor knew perhaps what they meant themſelves. It is certain at leaſt, that their words do no more favour Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation than any other. The Tranſlation of the *Vulgar* Latin is very exact, *elegit ſuſpendium anima mea*, &c. VI. There is no doubt but that the Hebrew חנק ſignifies to *choak* or *ſuffocate* by any means whatſoever, but it does not follow that the Greek ἀπάγχεσθαι is uſed in any other notion than that of *hanging*; nor is any other ſignification to be affixed to it where the diſcourſe relates to a perſon in deſpair, and that chuſes Death rather than Life, which was the caſe of *Judas* and *Achitophel*. VII. But our *Author* tells us, that it is neceſſary to put another ſenſe upon this word, in order to reconcile St. *Luke* with St. *Matthew*. This would be true, if we could not make them agree any other way; which we may very well do by compounding both their accounts together thus: Καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο, καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ: *And going away hanged himſelf, and falling down forwards he burſt aſunder in the midſt, and all his bowels guſhed out.* But it may be asked, if he hanged himſelf, how could he fall down? to which I anſwer, ἐκ περιῤῥήτου βρόχου ἢ ἀποκοπείς ἀπό τινος, *by the ropes breaking, or by being cut down by ſome body*; which circumſtance, as long as it was known that he killed himſelf in deſpair, was not thought material enough to be ſet down. But it may be ſaid again, How came he to burſt aſunder, and his bowels to guſh out? I anſwer, becauſe he fell down from on high, as he muſt needs have done if he hanged himſelf upon the battlement of ſome Terras, or upon a Tree that leaned over a deeper Valley than ordinary; for then if he fell upon ſome ſtone, or ſtump, or ſtake, that was underneath, his belly might eaſily be ripped open. *Pricæus* upon this place has given us ſeveral Examples of this nature, and the thing is plain. But never did any Woman, by a ſuffocation of the Mother, burſt aſunder in the midſt, and much leſs did ever any Man do ſo. Our Author ſhould have given us but one ſuch inſtance at leaſt; but I am ſure he was not able. The Interpretation I have given is not only the moſt natural, but agrees exactly with the words. The learned Perſon I but now ſpake of, who has written largely and on ſet purpoſe about this matter, does indeed very well ſhew that the verb ἀπάγχεσθαι ſignifies to kill by hanging; but he has not proved that *Judas*, as he conjectures, was thrown down from ſome ſteep Rock as a mark of infamy ſet upon him. It does not appear from any

any Teſtimony, that thoſe who killed themſelves were ſo puniſhed by the *Jews*. Beſides, the Phraſe πρηνὴς γενόμενος ſufficiently intimates that the Body of *Judas* was not conveyed to any other place to be thrown down from; for that would rather have been expreſſed by καὶ πίπτειν ἐφθὴς, or ſome other ſuch words; but the word γενόμενος ſignifies that the Body fell down without any forcible impulſe. It may be enquired perhaps why St. *Matthew* did not add the Circumſtance taken notice of by St. *Luke*, and why St. *Luke* did not make mention of *Judas*'s hanging himſelf? To which I anſwer, it may reaſonably enough be ſuppoſed that St. *Matthew* heard only of his *hanging*, and St. *Peter* who ſpeaks in *Acts* i. only of his falling down ſome ſteep place; and tho both were true, yet they related ſeverally the ſtory juſt as they had heard it. That in a matter of no great moment, all the Circumſtances are not exactly ſet down, let ſuch only wonder, as have not obſerved that Circumſtances of much greater moment are frequently paſſed over by one or other of the *Evangeliſts*, as appears from other places. Compare St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke* as to what they both ſay about the *Thieves* that were crucified with *Chriſt*. Chapter XXVII.

Verſ. 15. *Note* d.] There are ſome things in this laſt Note that need Correction. I. The Phraſe *ad faciendum populum* is not a Latin Phraſe, nor has any ſignification, but I believe it was an Error of the *Printer*'s, and that the *Doctor* wrote *ad faciendum ſibi favorem apud populum*. II. What is here ſaid about the ſingular Privilege of the Citizens of *Rome*, has no affinity with the matter in hand; for tho a Roman Citizen could not be put to death without the Suffrage of the People, yet I ſuppoſe *Pilate* did not wait for the conſent of the *Jews* to empower him to behead ſuch as he judged guilty. He gratified the *Jews* when he let go a Criminal at their requeſt; and he did not condemn any at their requeſt, when they were otherwiſe affected, but of his own accord to get their favour: but in *Rome* no Magiſtrate had authority to behead any Citizen without the peoples Conſent, and thoſe that the people abſolved were to be let go whether the Magiſtrates would or not, and thoſe whom they condemned were certainly to be puniſhed. III. It would have been better obſerved that it was the cuſtom alſo among other Nations to releaſe their Priſoners upon feſtival days. So in *Athens* it was a Law, ἐν ταῖς Θεσμοφορίοις λύειν τὰς δεσμώτας, that *at the time when the Feaſts were kept in honour of* Ceres, *the Priſoners ſhould be let looſe*. And the ſame was practiſed upon other Athenian Feaſts, as *Sam. Petitus* has ſhewn, *Lib.* 1. *de Legg. Att.* Tit. 1. See likewiſe *Iſ. Caſaubon* in his Notes upon *Suet.* Tib. *cap.* lxi. IV. This Cuſtom was imitated by the Chriſtian Emperors, who for *joy* at the *Paſſover* gave order

Chapter XXVII. order in their Letters that the Prisons should be opened. But that you may not mistake, this was done in honour not of the *Jewish*, but of the *Christian* Passover, and the *Jews* were released no more than others; which contradicts what the *Doctor* says. So in *Cod.* lib. 1. *Tit.* iv. *Leg.* 3. there is this Law made by *Valentinian*, *Theodosius* and *Arcadius*: *Ubi primus dies Paschatis extiterit, nullum teneat carcer inclusum, omnium vincula dissolvantur. As soon as the first day of the Passover is come, let there be none kept shut up in Prison; let them be all released of their Chains.* There is no mention at all here made of the *Jews*. And there are a great many such like Orders in *Cod. Theodos.* where the *Jews* are not mentioned. See the Collections of *Sam. Petitus* in the place before cited. 'Tis oftner than once that Dr. *Hammond* either adds or diminishes the sayings of the *Antients*, which he thought by being a little changed, would better illustrate the Writings of the New Testament. But yet I do not believe he did it designedly, who was so good a Man, and so great a lover of Truth, but rather was misled by others who were not so faithful as they should have been in their Citations.

Vers. 28. Χλαμύδα κοκκίνην.] It is true indeed that the *Consuls* and *Pretors* wore Gowns of divers colours, or such as were used in Triumphs when they made any publick Shows, as has been shewn by *Oct. Ferrarius*, *Part* ii. *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. but that which is respected here is the Custom of Kings, who thought it lawful for no body to wear Purple Robes but themselves. Thus it is observed by *Hirtius* cap. lvii. de Bello Africano. *Cum Scipio sagulo purpureo ante Regis adventum, uti solitus esset, dicitur Juba cum eo egisse, non oportere illum eodem uti vestitu, atque ipse uteretur.* Scipio *using to wear a Purple Coat before the King's arrival, they say that* Juba *reproved him, and told him that he ought not to wear the same Garment that he wore.* About this sort of Robe called *Chlamys* consult *Ferrarius*.

Vers. 34. *Note* f.] Tho it be very true what our *Author* observes concerning the abuse of the Greek words κρὴ & θυμὸς in the Translation of the *Septuagint*, yet he perfectly forces the place which he cites out of *Rev.* xiv. 10. as the Reader would easily have perceived, if he had set it all down. For these are the words: *The same shall drink of the Wine* θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ *of the Wrath of God which is mixed with pure Wine in the cup of his Anger.* See *Isa.* li. 17.

Vers. 44. *Note* h.] I confess that this latter Interpretation carries no repugnancy in it, but yet it has not the least shadow of likelihood. For who can conceive that a wicked wretch, who had just before reviled *Christ*, should be so changed in a moment of time as to acknowledg

ledg him to be the *Meſſias?* Yes, they ſay, becauſe it was effected by a ſecret divine Power? But who reveal'd this to them? The *Evangeliſts* ſay no ſuch thing. It is much more likely that Thieves being many times puniſh'd not only for Crimes which they have *lately* committed, but alſo for *old* ones, this Man had already had ſome knowledg of *Chriſt*, and repented, and believed on him before he was caſt into Priſon; and then being afterwards apprehended and convicted of Theft, was crucified by the Romans without any regard had to his Repentance. Chapter XXVIII.

I do by no means therefore think that this Thief railed at *Chriſt:* Nor do I think that St. *Matthew* ſpake figuratively, when he ſaid *Thieves* for *Thief:* It is a meer Impropriety, as the Examples cited by our *Author* ſhew, to which add thoſe words in *Chap.* ii. 20. where ſpeaking of *Herod*'s being dead, *it is ſaid — they are dead that ſought the young Child's Life.*

Verſ. 15. *Note* i.] I. Whether any ſuch Earthquake is mentioned by *Macrobius* I do not know, but there is mention made of it in *Tacitus* Annal. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 47. and *Suetonius* in *Tiber. cap.* 48. See Interpreters upon the place. II. Since our Author reckons *the Tombs* amongſt the parts of the Temple, he had done well to tell us what perſons were ever buried in that Mountain upon which the Temple ſtood; for nothing being more unclean according to the Jewiſh Statutes than a *Sepulchre*, which polluted thoſe that went over them, as has been obſerved upon *Chap.* xxiii. 27. it is too ſtrange to be true that there were any Sepulchres in a place of the greateſt Sanctity. I know St. *Jerom* in *Catal. Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tells us this of St. *James* who was thrown down by the Jews from the Pinacle of the Temple, out of *Hegeſippus: Juxta Templum, ubi & præcipitatus fuerat, ſepultus eſt. Titulum uſq; ad obſidionem Titi, & ultimam Hadriani notiſſimum habuit. He was buried near the Temple, and in the place where he had been thrown down, and had a Monument erected for him which continued famous to the ſiege of* Titus, *and the laſt of* Hadrian. *Hegeſippus*'s Teſtimony is extant in *Euſebius*'s Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib.* 2. *c.* 23. But this very thing renders the Hiſtory ſuſpicious, as has been well remarked by *H. Valeſius*, to paſs by others that have very little appearance of truth in them.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Verſ. 2. Σεισμὸς] This is well interpreted by our Author, of *a concuſſion in the Air*; for in the *Septuagint* alſo the Whirlwind by which *Elijah* was caught up into Heaven, is

Chapter XXVIII

is called συσεισμὸς, 2 *King.* xi. 11. So *Suidas:* Συσεισμὸς, λαίλαψ, συτροφὴ ἀνέμου, *a Storm, a Whirlwind.* And thus the *Latins* also say *cœlum tonitru concuti*, to signify the concussion that is made in the Air when it thunders.

Vers. 19.] Μαθητεύσατε — βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς.] That is, by Baptism make them the Disciples of *Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghost*, and willing to be so called. For μαθητεύω is to *make Disciples*, and βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα is *to be baptized, that we may be called by that name.* The *Jews* might have bin called the *Disciples of the Father*, because they professed themselves his Disciples; the *Apostles*, before they had received the Holy Ghost, and the rest of *Christ*'s Disciples might properly have bin called the *Disciples of the Father and the Son*; but those who were afterwards baptized by the Apostles, were the Disciples of the *Father*, as revealing his Will in the Old Testament, and of the *Son* as speaking in the Gospels, and of the *Holy Ghost*, as more clearly explaining the Precepts of the *Father* and *Son* by the *Apostles.* The Hebrew Phrase for this would be נטבלו לשמם *i. e.* they were baptized that they might be called by their name. That this is the true importance of this form of Speech may appear by 1 *Cor.* i. 12. and *seqq.* where the *Corinthians* saying, *I am of* Paul, *and I of* Apollos, *and I of* Cephas, *and I of Christ*, i. e. calling themselves their Disciples, and as it were distinguishing themselves from one another by the names of their several Masters or Teachers; *Paul* says, *Were ye baptized in the NAME of* Paul? *I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but* Crispus *and* Gaius, *lest any should say that I had baptized IN MY NAME*; that is, that ye might be called my Disciples, and distinguished from others by the Title of *Paulites.* So in the Writings of the Rabbins, *to be baptized* לשם עבדה *in the name of Servitude* is for the Person so baptized to become a Servant, and to take that name upon him. And on the contrary, *to be baptized* לשם בן חורין או לשם נירות *in the name of a Son of free Men, or in the name of Proselytism*, is to receive Baptism upon condition that the Person baptized be called a *Freeman* or *Proselyte.* Consult *Selden* de *Jure Nat.* & *Gent.* lib. 2. c. 3. *Grotius* has committed a mistake in his Translation of the last words; but discerned however the import of the Phrase, tho *just as a Man sees the Moon through the Clouds.*

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *Mark*.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 1. ΑΡΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ.] Theſe words I rather take to be as an Inſcription to this whole Book, than a form of introducing what follows, as the *Doctor* does in his Paraphraſe. For even in the moſt antient times, theſe Books were called the *Goſpels*, as *Grotius* has obſerved out of *Juſtin*, at the beginning of St. *Matthew*. And it is ordinary in Latin Manuſcripts to find it written in the front, ſuch or ſuch a Book BEGINS, that the Reader may know the work to be entire, and that there wants nothing at the beginning. Such another Inſcription as this, is that of the Book of the Prophet *Hoſea* i. 2. *The beginning of the word of the Lord to* Hoſea. I conceive therefore that theſe words ought to have a full ſtop made at the end of them.

Verſ. 2. Ὡς γέγραπται, &c.] We muſt conceive this beginning thus: AS *it is written in the Prophet* Iſaiah; *Behold I ſend my Meſſenger before thy face, who ſhall prepare thy way before thee: A Voice crying in the Deſart, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths ſtreight:* John *BAPTIZED*, &c. The force of the Particle AS belongs to the 4*th* Verſe, where there is, as it were, an ἀπόδοσις, by which the *Evangeliſt* ſhews that the Event was anſwerable to what was foretold. Some learned Men have thought that the beginning of *Herodotus* is juſt like

 this,

Chapter II. this, but without reaſon, as will appear to any one that compares them.

Verſ. 38. *Note* b.] Our learned *Author* is miſtaken, when he ſays that the word ἐχέμυθος ſignifies here *adjoining*, from the *uſe* of it in the *Septuagint*. For ſo all the beſt *Greek* Writers, who were ſtrangers to the barbarous Dialect of the *Septuagint*, uſed that word. It occurs very often in *Herodotus* in that ſignification, as the *Ionick Lexicon* of *Æmilius Portus* alone will ſhew.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 26. *Note* b. I Chuſe rather to interpret the Particle ἐπὶ by *apud*, *at* or *to*, according to its uſual ſignification, and ſo the ſenſe will be, *He went* (viz. *David*) *into the Houſe of God, to* Abiathar *the High-prieſt*. The Phraſe οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Houſe of God*, is taken here more largely, not for the *Tabernacle* only, but alſo for the houſe in which the *High-prieſt* lived, which joined to the Tabernacle or Court. For the Loaves which *David* took away were not any longer in the Sanctuary, but had been removed before he came, that freſh ones might be put in their place, as the *ſacred Hiſtorian* informs us, 1 *Sam.* xxi. 6. So in the ſame Book *Chap.* iii. 3. by the *Temple of the Lord*, we are to underſtand the Houſe adjoining to the Court, in which *Samuel* ſlept, not far from the place where *Eli* lay down. But you will ſay, why dos not *Chriſt* ſay [to *Abimelech*] who was at that time the *High-prieſt*, but inſtead of that ſays [to *Abiathar*] who was *Abimelech*'s Son, and lived rather in his Father's Houſe than his own? The reaſon is, becauſe *Abiathar* was more known than *Abimelech*, by the Sacred Hiſtory, as the Learned have obſerved. And ſo the meaning of *Chriſt* is this: *he went to* Abiathar, *who was High-prieſt, tho not at that time*.

CHAP. III.

Chapter III. Verſ. 21. *Note* c. D*Avid le Clerc*, my Uncle, has treated upon this place in his *Quæſtiones Sacræ*, Quæſt. xiii. which is worth the reading.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 1. Καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ] *i. e.* in a little ſhip at a ſmall diſtance from the ſhore. Thus *Prov.* xxiii. 34. *be that lieth down in the heart of the Sea*, is one that lies down in a Ship. And to the ſame ſenſe is that of *Propertius* Lib. 1. Eleg. xiv.

Tu licet, abjectus Tiberinâ molliter unda,
Lesbia Mentoreo vina bibas opere.

This would have been a needleſs remark, unleſs a man of a ſharp wit, and whoſe judgment in critical matters is not to be deſpiſed, *viz. Tan. Faber* in *Epiſt. Crit.* Part 2. Epiſt. xvii. would have had this place, contrary to the Authority of all Copies, altered, by reading it ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ *in a Ship*, and not ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ *in the Sea*, which would not go down with him.

Verſ. 12. *Note* a.] This form of ſpeech has ſomething *proverbial* in it, and is ſet to ſignify ſuch Perſons as, if they made a right uſe of their faculties, would take notice of thoſe things which their folly makes them paſs over without attention. And in this ſenſe the *Greeks* alſo uſed it. Thus *Prometheus* is repreſented in *Æſchilus* as ſpeaking in this manner of the ignorance of men in the firſt age, before he had taught them arts:

Οἳ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην
Κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον, ἀλλ' ὀνειράτων
Ἀλίγκιοι μορφαῖσι, τὸν μακρὸν χρόνον
Ἔρρεπτον εἰκῇ πάντα.

They at firſt ſeeing, ſaw in vain;
Hearing they did not hear; but juſt
As men in dreams, for a longtime
Confounded all things.

And ſo *Demoſthenes* Orat. 1. *contra Ariſtogit.* ſect. 123. Τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὁρῶντας μὲν ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἀκούοντας μὲν ἀκούειν: *according to the Proverb, that thoſe that ſee do not ſee, and thoſe that hear do not hear.*

Chapter V.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 22. Note c. SInce *a Synagogue* does ſometimes ſignify *a Conſiſtory of Judges*, whoſe Authority related to civil matters, it is certain that the perſon who preſided over them might well enough be called ἀρχισυνάγωγος. Of the word συναγωγὴ as ſignifying a Conſiſtory or Sanhedrim, ſee our Author's notes upon *Matt.* vi. 5. The Judges and the Preſidents of Eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies, which our Author has forgot to obſerve, were called by the ſame name of ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, becauſe they were the ſame Perſons; of which ſee the learned *Camp. Vitringa*, de *Synag.* Lib. 2. c. 9. But Dr. *Hammond* in what follows ſeems to confound בית מדרש *a School* with בית דין *a conſiſtory of Judges*, which are quite different things.

Verſ. 30. Δυναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν] If this Phraſe were to be underſtood properly and literally, we ſhould be obliged to think that *Chriſt* cured the ſick of their Diſeaſes by certain *effluvia* that proceeded from him, which is very difficult to conceive. And therefore I rather think, with *Grotius*, that this was a *vulgar way of ſpeaking*, by which we are to underſtand no more, than that this Woman was cured by *God*, at the inſtant in which ſhe touched our Saviour. See *Luke* vi. 19. where it will appear that that expreſſion was taken from the uſe of the common People.

Verſ. 34. ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε] *i. e.* hath healed thee. Thus *Barnabas* in *Epiſt. Cathol.* Cap. ix. brings in *Moſes* ſpeaking in this manner of the brazen Serpent: νικᾷς ὃν δύναται ζωοποιῆσαι, καὶ ἅπαξ ἐλάλησε συντέτριπται: it *being dead can make alive, and he ſhall preſently be ſaved*, i. e. *healed*, viz. that looks upon it.

CHAP. VI.

Chapter VI.

Verſ. 2. Τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ; ὅτι καὶ δυνάμεις, &c.] i. e. *What is this wiſdom which is given unto him? And how is it that ſuch Miracles are wrought by his hands?* For the particle ὅτι muſt not be joined with *Wiſdom*, which may be very great and yet ſeparate, in the Perſon that has it, from the power of doing Miracles; but it ſignifies the ſame with πῶς *how*. And ſo the Hebrew כי, which is very frequently rendered by ὅτι, is ſometimes uſed, as *Iſai.* xxix. 16. כי *How ſhould the work ſay of him that made it, he made me not?* See afterwards *Chap.* ix. 11, 28. of this Goſpel.

Verſ.

Verſ. 5. Οὐκ ἠδύνατο] *i. e.* According to the laws which he had pre- Chapter
ſcribed to himſelf, he could not there do any miracles. For he did not VI.
uſe to work Miracles where he was not ſought unto to work them, or
where no body believed that he was able to work them. *He could not* therefore, is as much as *he would not.* The *Evangeliſt*, to uſe the words of *Hierocles*, τὸ τ' ἀναγκαίως ἢ τ' φύσεως μᾶλλον τῶν δυναμεων κρατύνει, *ſpeaks of a moral and not a natural power.* And *Hierocles* is in the right when he tells us, δυνατώτερον εἶναι τῶν τῆ ἀνάγκῃ τ' ἔξωθεν βίας, τὸ τῶν ἐμφρόνων: *that the neceſſity of the mind is more powerful than any external force, with wiſe men.* See his Notes on *Pythag. Aur. Carm.* ver. 8.

Verſ. 8. Εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον.] To reconcile theſe words with *Matt.* x. 10. it muſt be taken for certain in the firſt place, that the *Evangeliſts* do not always ſet down the very words of *Chriſt*, but very frequently only his ſenſe, as appears manifeſtly by comparing them together. And then the ſenſe may be the ſame, tho at firſt ſight the words ſeem to contradict one another. Now the meaning of *Chriſt* here is only this, that the Apoſtles were not to make any preparation or proviſion for their journey; and that may as well be expreſſed in the words of *one* Evangeliſt as the *other*. In St. *Matthew* it is, *Do not get any gold or ſilver or braſs in your purſes, nor any ſatchel for your journey, nor any ſtaff, for the workman is worthy of his food.* The plain meaning of this is, that *God* would take care of thoſe things which were neceſſary for the *Apoſtles*, and therefore that they were immediately to ſet upon their journey without making any preparation for it, but juſt as they were. If it happened that they *had* a Staff already in their hands, there is no command given them to *throw* it away; but if they had never a one, they are forbidden to *get* any, or to furniſh themſelves with any thing that they *then* had not. And this, as to the ſenſe, is not contrary to what is here ſaid in S. *Mark*; *He commanded them that they ſhould take nothing for their journey, ſave a ſtaff only, no ſatchel*, &c. *i. e.* to begin their Journey juſt as they were when he ſpake to them, with a ſtaff only, which ſome of them perhaps already had, without getting any thing that they wanted. If the words of both the Evangeliſts were to be expreſſed together in a Paraphraſe, they might moſt fitly be explained thus: *Go immediately and preach the Goſpel, provide no money, nor clothes, nor victuals for your Journey. Thoſe that have ſtaves let them travel only with them; and thoſe that have none let them not get any, but enter upon their Journey without. They whom you preach the Goſpel to, God ſo ordering it, will furniſh you with all neceſſaries.*

Verſ.

Chapter VII.

Verſ. 20. *Note* b.] Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion may be confirmed by the Authority of the *Gloſſes* of *Philoxenus*, in which συντηρῶ is rendered by *conſervo*, *to preſerve*, and συντηρεῖ *conſervat*, *tuetur*, *preſerves*, *defends*.

Verſ. 46. *Note* f.] See my Notes on *Gen.* iv. 8.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. IT is true indeed that the word κοινὸς ſignifies *polluted* as well as *common*; but the proper ſignification of it ſeems to be *common*, whence by a Metaphor it was uſed to ſignify *polluted*, becauſe thoſe things which are intended for common uſe, are generally polluted, by ſuch uſe. II. The Greek πυγμὴ cannot properly be ſaid to be *a part of the hand* or *arm*, but is the hand contracted to make the fiſt. So *Heſych.* Πυγμὴ, γρὶθος. ἴσως τὸ συγκλείσασθαι τοὺς δακτύλους, *the fiſt, or the ſhutting up of the fingers.* And *Phavorinus*, Πυγμὴ, δὲν ἡ χειρὶς, ὅταν ἴσχῃ τοὺς συνεσταλμένους τοὺς δακτύλους: *in the hand, when a perſon has his fingers contracted.* It is rather the contraction of the hand than the hand it ſelf; but by a Metaphor it may ſignify the hand it ſelf. The Phraſe Πυγμῇ βαπτίσασθαι therefore is not properly *to be waſhed up to the wriſt* עד הפרק, as the *Rabbins* ſpeak, but to put the fiſt into water, or to be waſhed with the hand contracted; tho conſidered in it ſelf, the thing be much the ſame. See *Joſ. Scaliger* upon *Serarius* cap. 7. and *H. Grotius*. *Palladius* abuſed the word when he applyed it to the feet. III. This Cuſtom of waſhing the hands amongſt the *Jews*, had its riſe in part from the Law: *Levit.* xv. 11. *Whomſoever he that hath the iſſue toucheth, and hath not waſhed his hands, he ſhall waſh his clothes*, &c. The *Jews* thought that by this Law, as they miſunderſtood it, he that had been touched by one who had an Iſſue, was preſently to waſh his hands, or elſe he was obliged to waſh his clothes and all his body. And therefore when they came out of any mixed aſſembly of people, amongſt which there might poſſibly be ſome ſuch unclean perſons, they immediately waſhed their hands. But *the not having the hands waſhed*, in that place of *Moſes*, relates to the man that had the *iſſue*, and not to him whom he had *touched*.

Verſ. 4. *Note* c.] In the beginning of this Note our *Author* ſpeaking of *Eupolis*, ſays *Tragedy* inſtead of *Comedy*; for *Eupolis* was a Comedian, and we have no account of his having ever wrote any Tragedy. The Play called *Baptæ* is ſaid alſo to have been a Comedy, and it's certain that Poets did not uſe to inveigh againſt thoſe that they had a hatred againſt in Tragedies, but only in Comedies. See the *Scholiaſt* upon *Juvenal*, Sat. 2. v. 92. concerning this Comedy of *Eupolis*.

Ibid.

Ibid. Καὶ κλινῶν.] Here our Author, in his Paraphraſe, has theſe words, *and alſo of beds* ON *which they did eat then as* NOW *on tables.* Now it is certain that they had heretofore Tables to eat on as well as now; but only whereas we ſit upon chairs or benches, they *ſat* upon beds: the *Meat* was placed upon Tables, as well as it is now, tho the Gueſts ſat upon beds. And this, I doubt not, Dr. *Hammond* very well knew, only he was not careful enough to avoid ſpeaking improperly. As for the reaſon why the beds in thoſe Chambers where they dined were waſhed, that was becauſe poſſibly they might be polluted by ſome or other that ſat upon them; and ſo if they were not waſhed, they might defile the next comers. See *Levit.* xv. 4. *& ſeqq.* Chapter VII.

Verſ. 22. *Note* d.] Tho St. *Paul* charges thoſe that boaſt with folly ἀφροσύνη, yet it does not follow that that word ſignifies *boaſting*, and may be underſtood ſo when it is alone; becauſe all boaſting indeed is ἀφροσύνη, but all ἀφροσύνη is not *boaſting*. Our *Author* very often impoſes new ſignifications upon words different from what they are uſed in; tho it is certain that Uſe is the great thing that determins what words ſignify, according to that of the *Poet*,

Quem penes arbitrium eſt & jus & norma loquendi.

That I may diſcuſs therefore the ambiguity of this word, by the uſe of it; I obſerve that ἄφρων ſignifies two things, whereof one is a diſtemper of the brain, and the other of the mind. Sometimes it is taken for *madneſs* proceeding from ſome diſeaſe, or diſturbance of the brain, without any fault in the patient. And in this ſenſe the word ἄφρων ſignifies a Perſon that is not in his right ſenſes. But this ſignification has no place here, where the diſcourſe is about a diſtemper of the mind. And in this acceptation again it is uſed two ways; firſt ἄφρων ſignifies *imprudent*, and is oppoſed to ξύνιμος *prudent*: and ἀφροσύνη ſignifies *imprudence* in oppoſition to ξύνεσις *prudence*. Secondly, ἄφρων ſignifies alſo *intemperate*, contrary to which is σώφρων *temperate*, as in like manner ἀφροσύνη is uſed for *intemperance*, and is oppoſed to σωφροσύνη *temperance*. And in this laſt ſenſe it is taken here in St. *Mark*; for imprudence without malice, which is very common, does not pollute the mind out of which it proceeds. But as ἀφροσύνη ſignifies a habit and actions oppoſite to σωφροσύνη, that is, Intemperance and its uſual effects, are ſins which do really defile the mind. I need not bring many examples to prove that theſe words are uſed in the ſignifications mentioned, for they may be had out of Lexicons, tho theſe do not ſufficiently

Chapter VII. ciently diſtinguiſh them. I ſhall produce only a few: I. Ἄφρων ſignifies *mad* in theſe words of *Xenophon*, *de Exped. Cyri*, lib. 4. towards the end, where he ſpeaks of the honey of *Colchis*, whereof the *Greeks* not knowing its nature, had eaten: ὅσοι ἔφαγον τοῦ σεσηνωτοῦ μέλιτος ἄφρονες τε ἐγίγνοντο, καὶ ἔμεον: *all the Soldiers that did eat of it became mad, and vomited.* But the next day after, as he tells us in what follows, ἀμφὶ τὰν αὐτὰν ὥραν ἐγένοντο, *about the ſame hour they came to their right ſenſes again.* II. Ἀφρῶν ſignifies *imprudent*, and ἀφροσύνη *imprudence.* Thus *Homer* Iliad. Γ. ver. 220. ſpeaking of the outward appearance of *Ulyſſes*, ſays:

Φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τινα ἔμμεναι, ἄφρονά τ' αἴσυλον.

You would ſay that he was an angry ſort of man, and one that acted raſhly and imprudently. And *Iliad.* H. *ver.* 110. *Menelaus* deſiring to fight with *Hector* in a ſingle combat, is commanded to abſtain from that piece of *imprudence*, Οὐδέ τι οἱ χρὼ, ſays *Agamemnon*, ταύτης ἀφροσύνης, *you have no need to be guilty of this imprudence.* III. Laſtly, Ἀφροσύνη is oppoſed to σωφροσύνη, and in contrary actions is uſed in the ſame latitude. As in *Xenophon* lib. 3. *de Inſtit. Cyri*, not far from the beginning, where after *Tigranes* had ſaid ἀνὰ σωφροσύνης, ἐν ἄλλῃ ἀρετῇ οὐδὲν ὄφελος εἶναι, *that without temperance no other vertue is of any uſe*, ἄφρων is ſeveral times oppoſed to σώφρων: and then afterwards *Tigranes* adds, ὅπου δέδυκας καὶ ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς δι' ἀφροσύνης μὴ ἐπιχειρῆσαι κρείττονι ἑαυτῷ μάχεσθαι, ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡττηθῇ, ἐξαῦτις παυομένου τὴν ἀφροσύνης; *have you never obſerved ſo much as one man, that through intemperance (i. e.* tranſported with Anger or any other extravagant paſſion) *went to fight with one ſtronger than himſelf, how after he was beaten, his intemperance againſt that man was preſently cooled?*

So likewiſe among the Hebrews נבל *nabal* ſignifies *mad* and intemperate, and נבלה *nbalah* madneſs and intemperance; and the former is rendered in both ſenſes by ἄφρων, and the latter by ἀφροσύνη in the *Septuagint*. See *Pſalm* xiv. 1. where the word נבל *mad* does not ſignify one that is mad ἀφροσύνῃ through a *bodily* diſtemper, or is imprudent through an *error* in his mind, but a *wicked* evil man. And ſo נבלה is not only *folly*, but a bad or wicked action. See *Deut.* xxii. 21. *Judg.* xix. 23, 24. xx. 6, 10. And yet the *Septuagint* have in theſe places ἀφροσύνη, and in *Pſal.* xiv. ἄφρων. And hence it came to paſs that *Phavorinus*, and *Suidas* before him, miſinterpreted the word ἄφρων by ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς τὸ ὄντως ὄντων, ἀμαθὴς τὰ σοφίας, *one that is ignorant of the true God, and unacquainted with the firſt principles of Wiſdom.*

Verſ.

Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 35. Ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς.] If this man was naturally deaf and dumb, as Dr. *Hammond* ſeems to think, the meaning of theſe words muſt be, that he imitated rightly thoſe ſounds which he heard made by others; for it was neceſſary that he ſhould have ſome *time* allowed him to learn to *diſcourſe* in, even after that which obſtructed his organs of ſpeech was removed. But if we ſuppoſe, that whereas he heard and ſpake before readily, he came by a diſeaſe to be deprived almoſt of his hearing, and to ſpeak with difficulty, as *Grotius* thought, then theſe words muſt be underſtood in their uſual and obvious ſenſe. And this makes me prefer this Opinion to the former, which is moſt agreeable alſo to the proper ſignification of the word μογιλάλος, which cannot ſignify a dumb perſon any otherwiſe than figuratively.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 11. Ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.] Tho all divine Miracles are *from Heaven*, i. e. from *God*; yet I am apt to believe that here is meant ſuch a Miracle as was ſeen by *John* the *Baptiſt* at the time when he baptized our Saviour, viz. *when the heavens were opened unto him, and he ſaw the Spirit of God deſcending like a dove and lighting upon him, and behold a voice from heaven, ſaying, This is my beloved ſon in whom I am well pleaſed.*

Verſ. 12. Τῷ πνεύματι] This word is uſed to expreſs the vehemence of the groan, which *Chriſt* fetched upon this occaſion; juſt as *Acts* xvii. 16. when St. *Paul* was at *Athens*, and ſaw the City filled with Idols παρῳξύνετο, it is ſaid, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, *his Spirit was ſtirred up within him*; which expreſſion denotes the vehemence of the commotion that was in St. *Paul*'s mind. The word πνεῦμα does not only ſignify barely the mind, but the mind moved by ſome *paſſion*; as the Hebrew רוח, of which conſult *Schindler's* Lexicon.

Verſ. 24. Ὡς δένδρα περιπατοῦντας.] The ſenſe of theſe words is rightly expreſſed by our *Author* in his Paraphraſe; but he tells us in the Margin that the *King*'s MS. and many printed Copies, read βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ, περιπατοῦντας. Yet ſtill theſe words ὡς δένδρα περιπατοῦντας make but harſh conſtruction, and I do not know but that the antient reading was ὡς δένδρα περιπατοῦντα, *as trees that walk*; and ſo the meaning of the blind man will be, that two ſorts of objects preſented themſelves to him, whereof one ſtood ſtill, *viz.* Trees; and another, which were alſo like Trees to his apprehenſion, walked, or were like walking Trees. The *Syriack* דמהלכין is ambiguous, and may as fitly be rendered *I ſee men like walking trees*, as *like trees walking*. Perhaps

Chapter IX. the *Evangeliſt* wrote as I ſaid, but the Tranſcribers would not endure *Ἀνθρωπα περιπατοῦντα walking trees.*

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 13. Καθὼς ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ] *Grotius* thinks that what is ſaid here of the Jews, *that they had done to John whatſoever they would*, is ſaid to have been foretold by *Malachi*, becauſe he called him *Elias*: and *this very thing*, ſays he, *ſhewed that he ſhould not want Ahabs and Jezebels.* But this ſeems to have too much ſubtilty in it, nor was it neceſſary that there ſhould be a perfect ſimilitude between *John* and *Elias*, that he might be intended by the Prophet by his name. I chuſe rather to make the words *as it is written of him*, to refer only to thoſe, *Elias is come*; as if *Chriſt* had ſaid, *Elias is come, as it is written of him, and they have done to him whatſoever they would*; the miſplacing and croſs ordering of words being uſual in Scripture. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xiii. 10. As for the ſenſe of this whole paſſage, it is in the general well enough expreſſed by our *Author* in his Paraphraſe; but if we read *Chriſt*'s words, and would underſtand by what Dr. *Hammond* ſays, the ſeries or connection of his Diſcourſe, we ſhall find our ſelves diſappointed. I expreſs it therefore thus: "12. But "*Chriſt* anſwered them, it was requiſite indeed that *Elias* ſhould firſt "come, and call all the *Jews* to their duty, that they might entertain "the *Meſſias*, who was ſuddenly to come amongſt them, in a fit man"ner; nor was this Prophecy contrary to thoſe by which it was fore"told that the *Meſſias* ſhould be ill treated by the *Jews*: 13. For *Elias* "alſo was already come, who was *John* the Baptiſt, intended for cer"tain reaſons by that name, and had gone about to call the *Jews* to "Repentance, that they might be ſo diſpoſed as perſons ought to be "who were to receive the *Meſſias*; but the *Jews* had refuſed to hear"ken to that holy man, yea and had killed him. The words of the *Evangeliſt* muſt be rendered thus: 12. *And he anſwering, ſaid unto them, Elias indeed muſt firſt come and reſtore all things. But how* (πῶς) *is it written of the Son of Man, that he muſt ſuffer many things, and be ſet at nought?* 13. *But yet* (ἀλλὰ) *I ſay unto you, that both Elias is come, and they have alſo done unto him whatſoever they would.*

For the better underſtanding of theſe words there are theſe three things to be obſerved: *Firſt*, That the Apoſtles underſtood the verb ἀποκαθιστᾷ of the event, whence they inferred that it was impoſſible that *Chriſt* ſhould be killed by the *Jews*; becauſe he was not to enter upon his Reign till a great Reformation had been made among the People of the

Jews

Jews by *Elias*. But *Chriſt*'s anſwer, which is grounded upon matter of fact, ſhews that this ought to be underſtood of the deſign of *John*'s preaching, and what it would have effected if the *Jews* had *hearkened* to it, and not of what really came to paſs. That active Verbs do commonly ſignify a deſign and endeavour to do any thing, tho it may be the event does not follow, is known to every one. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xxxvii. 21. *Secondly*, that the words καὶ πῶς, *and how*, &c. contain another Objection which might be made againſt what *Chriſt* had ſaid, beſides that which was made by the Apoſtles, as the *interrogatory* Particle πῶς ſhews. *Thirdly*, That the Particle ἀλλὰ muſt be rendered by *attamen nevertheleſs*, or *but yet*, according to its uſual ſignification. See 1 *Cor.* iv. 4. Chapter IX.

Verſ. 23. Εἶπεν αὐτῇ, τὸ εἰ δύνασαι.] The Article τὸ is indeed, as *Grotius* has obſerved, ſuperfluous in *Luke* xxii. 2. as well as here; but the conſtruction in that place is different from what it is in this. I know all that is ſaid by others about this Particle; but to me nothing ſeems more probable, than that it proceeded from ſome Tranſcriber's repeating the laſt ſyllable of the foregoing word. It is certain, it is left out in *Beza*'s antient copy, and two others in the *Barberine* Library; and that neither the *Vulgar* nor *Syriack* verſion take any notice of it.

Verſ. 49. *Note* e.] 1. That *Chriſt*'s words here may be underſtood, they muſt firſt be ſet down in *Hebrew*, and then it muſt be ſhewn how fitly they are turned into Greek. The expreſſion in *Hebrew* is: כי הכל באש ימלח והכל המנחה במלח תמלח *for every one ſhall be conſumed by fire, and every offering of corn ſhall be ſeaſoned with ſalt.* And in the ſame manner it may be expreſſed in *Syriack*, as appears from the *Syriack* Interpreter. All the elegancy of the expreſſion lies in the ambiguity of the word ימלח *jimmaleahh*, which ſignifies both *ſalietur ſhall be ſeaſoned with ſalt*, and *abſumetur ſhall be conſumed*; which ambiguity cannot be expreſſed in *Latin*. Nor is the *Greek* Language more fit for this purpoſe, in which there is no word that ſignifies both *to ſeaſon with ſalt* and *to conſume*. Which the *Evangeliſt* perceiving, in imitation of the *Septuagint*, and the *Jews* who ſpake Greek in *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, he abuſed the verb ἁλίζεσθαι which properly ſignifies to be ſeaſoned with ſalt, by putting a new ſenſe upon it. And ſo *Symmachus* rendered afterwards the word נמלחו in *Iſai.* li. 6. *for the Heavens* נמלחו *ſhall be conſumed like ſmoke*, by ἁλισθήσονται, or rather ἁλίσονται. The meaning therefore of *Chriſt* in theſe words is this: that as every Corn-offering according to the Law extant in *Levit.* ii. 13. was ſeaſoned with ſalt ימלח: ſo likewiſe every bad man ſhall at laſt be conſumed ימלח with fire. The conjunction γὰρ

Chapter IX. prefixed to the words *every ſacrifice*, is of the ſame import here as the particle ὡς *as*, as it is afterwards *Chap.* x. 12. and *John* xiv. 30. That which ſeems to have occaſioned *Chriſt*'s comparing bad men to ſacrifices, is partly his having made uſe of the word יִמְלַח in order to deſcribe the future condition of the wicked; and partly his having made mention of *unquenchable fire*, ſuch as was the fire of the Altar, as *Grotius* has obſerved. And ſo becauſe the words by which he had deſcribed the Puniſhments of bad men had led him as it were to it, he did not decline the uſing of ſuch an ambiguity as might eaſily be underſtood by perſons skilful in the Language he ſpake in. And ſo likewiſe *God*, in the books of the *Prophets*, ſometimes uſes ſuch kind of elegances, proceeding from the ambiguity of words. See *Jer.* i. 11, 12. and at your leiſure *Mer. Caſaubon* in *Diſſ. de Lingua Hebraica.*

II. The conjecture of *Joſ. Scaliger* is by *Grotius*, and here by our Author deſervedly rejected; but he might have been more effectually confuted, if they had obſerved that St. *Mark* did not want a proper Greek word whereby to expreſs the Hebrew אשה, and ſo that there was no need of his coining that new and unheard of word πυρὶ. For that which the *Hebrews* expreſs by אשה *an offering to be conſumed* (באש) *with fire*, the *Greeks* call ἔμπυρον, a word which often occurs in *Euripides* and *Callimachus*, to mention no more. *Aquila*, who tranſlated words according to their Etymologies, could not have rendred the Hebrew word into Greek more fitly; it being derived from πῦρ fire, as the *Hebrew* from אש, which has the ſame ſignification. *Heſychius* and *Phavorinus* interpret Ἔμπυρα by τὰ καιόμενα ἱερεῖα, *ſacrifices which are burnt.*

III. Nevertheleſs, Dr. *Hammond* is miſtaken when he ſays that ἁλωθήσονται, which is the verb ἁλίσκω *to take*, ſignifies *ſhall be conſumed.* Ἀναλωθήσονται indeed from ἀναλίσκω has that ſignification, but this is not to be confounded with the tenſes of the verb ἁλίσκω.

Verſ. 50. *Note f.*] I do not know whence the *Doctor* took the paſſage he ſpeaks of out of *Æſchines*, but he does not ſeem to have looked into *Æſchines* himſelf. For it will appear to any one that reads the whole paſſage, that it is to be underſtood of the proviſion which was allowed to the Embaſſadors out of the publick revenue. The ſtory in ſhort is this. *Æſchines* and *Demoſthenes* were ſent together as Embaſſadors to King *Philip*, and eat at the ſame Table with the reſt of the Embaſſadors throughout the whole journey; nevertheleſs *Demoſthenes* accuſed *Æſchines* and the reſt of the Embaſſadors of having ill diſcharged their Commiſſion. And hereupon *Æſchines*, p. 31. *Ed. Stephani*, not far from the beginning, charges him with practiſing πανταχοῦ ἐπιβουλὰς καὶ ἀνδρῶν

ἀνδρῶν συνήθων καὶ συμπίοσιεων, ἃς οὐδὲ κατ' ἐχθίστων εἶναι ποιήσαιτο, *such Treachery towards his Companions at the same Table, and in the same Embassy, as a man would hardly be guilty of to his greatest Enemies.* And then it follows, τὸν γὰρ τῆς πόλεως ἅλας καὶ τὴν δημοσίαν τράπεζαν σεμνὸν φησὶ τοιοῦτος, ἐξ ὧν ἐπαινεῖται: *for he professes to have a high value for the salt of the City, and the publick Table, not being a Native of our Country,* &c. So among the *Latins* the publick Corn that was allowed to the *Military Tribunes* and others, was called *Salarium.* Chapter X.

CHAP. X.

Vers. 6. Ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.] This word κτίσεως not being in *Beza*'s antient Copy, nor in the *Syriack*, nor in the parallel place in St. *Matthew*, may justly be suspected. It is possible that some Transcriber thinking it not to be sufficient to say ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς might add the word κτίσεως, to shew that the beginning of the World was spoken of. But this was needless; the beginning of the World being called ἀρχὴ, by *way of eminence* as it were. See my Notes upon *Gen.* i. 1.

Vers. 12. *Note* a.] See my Notes upon *Mat.* ix. 14. and *Grotius* upon this place in St. *Mark*. The sense of *Christ*'s words is this: Whosoever puts away his Wife and marries another ought to be reputed an Adulterer, as a Woman that puts away her Husband and is married to another Man is an Adulteress. The Particle καὶ *and*, which begins the 12*th* Verse, is all one with ὡς *as*, as I observed before upon *Chap.* ix. 49. In this respect *Christ* levels the Husband with the Wife; whereas under the *Law* it was lawful for a *Man* to put away his Wife, tho not for a *Woman* to put away her Husband.

Vers. 17. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου, &c.] This whole Passage is explain'd by *Clemens Alexandrinus* in his Book entitled τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, and in §. 4. he sets it down, but not without some alterations, substituting synonimous words, and correcting some Hebraisms in it; which makes it probable to me, that tho he did not indeed read the Passage so in his Copy, yet thought however that it was all one whether he expressed it in the *Evangelist*'s own words, or in a little better *Greek*, in compliance perhaps with critical Ears. The beginning of it is this: ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσελθών τις ἐπυνθάνετο λέγων, &c.

Vers. 19. *Note* b.] What our *Author* says about the sense of the tenth Commandment is, I grant, true; but we shall interpret both *Moses* and St. *Mark* more *Grammatically*, if we understand the verb ἀποστερεῖν of those fraudulent methods by which a Person may endeavour

to

Chapter XI.

to invade another man's Poſſeſſions. For there are two ways of injuring our Neighbour, *viz.* by Theft, whether privately or by force, againſt the will of the Owner, and by taking away what belongs to another without any pretence of Right or Juſtice, which is forbidden in the *ſeventh* Precept of the *Decalogue*, or elſe by ſecret and cunning Devices, where the Law and a pretence of Right is made uſe of to cover the Injury, which is prohibited in the *tenth* Commandment, whereby all ſuch Artifices are made unlawful, whether they prove ſucceſsful or unſucceſsful: And this *Chriſt* here calls ἀποστερεῖν, *i. e.* to defraud. So the *Old Gloſſes*; Ἀποστερῶ *privo, defraudo, abnego*, to *deprive*, to *defraud*, to *deny ones Truſt*. Ἀποστερεῖ, inficiatur, *he diſowns or denies his Truſt, or the Debt charged upon him.* Ἀποστέρησις *fraus, abnegatio, denegatio.* Ἀποστερητὴς *fraudator, fraudulentus, inficiator.* See my Notes upon the *Decalogue*.

Verſ. 24. Πεποιθότας] *Chriſt* here ſhews what ſort of πλουσίους, or *rich Men*, they are that cannot heartily entertain his Doctrin, *viz.* ſuch as truſt more in their Riches, than to *God*'s Promiſes. And thoſe are ſaid to *truſt* in their Riches, who had rather preſerve *them*, than obey *God*; who promiſe themſelves a happy Life if they are but rich, and think themſelves ſo miſerable that no Piety can afford them any Comfort, if they are poor.

CHAP. XI.

Verſ. 13. *Note* a. THat the time of Harveſt was earlier in *Judæa* than ordinary, is well proved by our Author, of which ſee my Notes alſo upon *Exod.* ix. 32. And hence likewiſe he rightly infers that other Fruits were gathered ſooner in that Country than in many other places. But I have ſeveral Obſervations to make both with relation to this matter, and to what Dr. *Hammond* ſays in this Note.

I. That *Ariſtophanes* does ill confound the time of Wheat and Barly Harveſt among the *Phœnicians*, which fell out in *divers* Months. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xxx. 14.

II. I wonder that the *Doctor* ſhould ſpeak of the *Fruit of Trees* in *Judæa* without any diſtinction; whereas it is certain that all ſort of Fruits do no more come to their full growth at the ſame time in *that* Country than in *other* places: They have their Summer and Autumn Fruits in *Judæa* as well as elſewhere. Nor does it appear by the Paſſage cited out of *Philo*, that the Fruits of Trees were gathered at the ſame time with the *Corn*, as our *Author* ſays, but only that if the

Statue

Statue of *Caius* was ſet up in the Temple, it was to be feared that the *Jews* would deſtroy the ripe Corn: and then he adds that care was alſo to be taken for the gathering in of the Fruits, which the Country that was planted with Trees brought forth; which may be underſtood not only of the Fruits that were ripe at *that* time, but alſo of thoſe that were of a *later* growth, and which could not have been gathered if the Trees were deſtroyed before they came to perfection. Chapter XI.

III. I ſhould not doubt but that the Interpretation given by the *Doctor* of this place were true, if he had but produced any Example to ſhew that the *Greek* Phraſe καιρὸς σύκων might ſignify what he calls a *good Fig year*, or a *kindly ſeaſonable year for Figs*; and we French Men *une ſaiſon favorable aux figues*, i. e. ſo temperate a year that abundance of Figs came to their perfect ripeneſs in their proper ſeaſon. Thus in *Horace* a fruitful year is called *pomifer*, and *locuples frugibus annus*. But the words καιρὸς and χρόνος muſt not be confounded; for tho the latter do indifferently ſignify any time whatſoever, yet the former is taken only for *a particular juncture of time*, and for *opportunity*, and is therefore capable indeed of being uſed to ſignify ſet ſeaſons in the year, but not ſimply a *year*. Tho this it may be might be obſerved in favor of Dr. *Hammond*, that by καιρὸς here is not meant ſimply *year*, but as I may ſay ἐπιτηδεία ὥρα καιρὸς, *a ſeaſonable year*, or *a fit ſeaſon* to look every where for Figs in. But this likewiſe is ſomething harſh, and I want ſtill Examples of the like Phraſe, having never been able to find or meet with any.

IV. It had been better if our *Author*, inſtead of what he ſays about the time of Harveſt, had obſerved that there were two ſorts of Figs in *Judæa*, one of which might have been ripe at the time of the *Paſſover*, but the other not till the height of Summer. The former ſort are mentioned by *Solomon* in *Cant.* ii. 13. where, deſcribing the beginning of the Spring, he ſays among other things, *the Fig-tree hath brought her Figs to perfection*. And theſe were called *early Figs*, as we learn from *Theophraſtus* and *Pliny*, and were common in *Syria*. *Theophraſtus* Hiſt. Plant. *lib.* 4. *c.* 2. Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ἄλλος, ὃν καλοῦσί τινες Αἰγύπτιον σῦκον ἁμαρτάνοντες, ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γὰρ ὅλως οὐκ Αἰγυπτίου, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον Συρίου—— ἀειφύλλου δὲ——; i. e. as *Pliny* lib. xiii. c. 8. interprets him, *Quidam Ægyptiam ficum dixere, errore manifeſto, non enim in Ægypto naſcitur, ſed in Syria, ſemper comantibus foliis. Some have ſaid that it was the Egyptian Fig, but they were manifeſtly miſtaken, for it does not grow in* Egypt, *but in* Syria, *and its leaves always flouriſh.* And a little after *Theophraſtus* ſays; ἔχει δὲ ἅμα καὶ τὸν ὄπορον καὶ τὸν ὄνθον καρπόν. Ἀφαιρεμένου γὰρ θατέρου μετὰ κύνα, καὶ ὁ ὕπερος ἀνθεῖ φανερὸς κύμασι.——εἶτ' αὐξηθεὶς ἀνθεῖ ἀεὶ ἀκτῆσιν

καὶ

Chapter XI.

καὶ ἰσημερίαν. Ἀπὸ τότε δὲ διαμένῃ ὁ χειμὼν μέχρι κυνός. The ſenſe of which is thus expreſſed again by *Pliny*; *Pomo antecedentis anni circa canis ortus detracto, ſtatim alterum parit. Poſtea florem per Arcturum, hyeme fœtus enutriente. The laſt years Fruit being pulled off about the beginning of the dog-days, it preſently brings forth more. Then when the Sun riſes with* Arcturus *it bloſſoms again, the Winter nouriſhing its Fruit.* And that ſuch a ſort of Fig-tree as this is meant here, appears both by its having Leaves at that time, and by *Chriſt*'s going to look for Fruit upon it. This Fruit the *Jews* called בכורה *bicchourah*, as appears from *Hoſ.* ix. 10. where it is ſaid, *I found* Iſrael *like Grapes in the Wilderneſs, as the firſt ripe* כבכורה *in the Fig-tree.* And theſe Figs were very much valued, as *Jeremiah* informs us, *Chap.* xxiv. 2. *One Basket had very good Figs, like the Figs that are firſt ripe* הבכורות. See alſo *Iſa.* xxviii. 4. and *Mich.* vii. 1.

The other ſort of Figs were of a later growth, and ripened at the ſame time with Grapes. And it is this ſort that is mentioned in *Numb.* xiii. 24. and which were gathered in the Land of *Canaan* together with the Grapes, by the Spies that were ſent by *Moſes*, and brought to the *Jewiſh* Camp. The Trees which bear this ſort have no Leaves at the *Paſſover*, but the time of their firſt ſhooting out is at the approach of the Summer, as *Chriſt* teaches us, *Matth.* xxiv. 32. *Now learn*, ſays he, *a Parable from the Fig-tree: when its branch is yet tender, and putteth forth Leaves, ye know that Summer* τὸ θέρος *is nigh.* And ſo likewiſe afterwards here in St. *Mark* xiii. 28. I could illuſtrate all theſe things by a multitude of Citations out of the Antients if it were neceſſary: But I am not ambitious of the uſeleſs Copiouſneſs of ſome learned Men, who ſpend abundance of time in proving what might have been ſhewn in fewer words, and of whom I may ſay with *Callimachus*,

Ἀσπεὶς πταμενῆο μέγας ῥόθος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
Λύματα γᾶς, καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι σαῤῥετὸν ἕλκει.

V. Our *Author* indeed juſtly rejects the Conjecture of *D. Heinſius*, but he cenſures too ſeverely the changing of an *accent* or *ſpirit*, which it is certain are wanting in the moſt antient Copies; for who can be certain when he ſees this Particle οὐ written without an accent, whether it is to be read οὐ *not*, or οὗ *where?* This muſt neceſſarily be learned by the ſenſe, and when that is obſcure, the Reader is left in ſuſpence. And before ever he had objected to that learned Man, that no Example could elſewhere be found of any ſuch form of Speech as he conjectured this here to be, he ought himſelf to have produced a place in which

the

the Phraſe καιρὸς καρπῶν πὸς ſignified *a fruitful ſeaſon* for ſuch or ſuch a ſort of Fruit. Chapter XII.

CHAP. XII.

Verſ. 14. *Note* a. THis one thing is enough to ſhew that that *MS.* dos not contain the very words of the *Evangeliſts*, but a kind of a Paraphraſe of them: For it interprets the *Latin* word κῆνσον, to *Grecians* who did not underſtand that word, by one more familiar to them. So in the *Gloſſaries* for *Law-terms* publiſhed by *Car. Labbæus*, κῆνσος is explained to be εἶδος νομίσματος: whence it may be inferred that the κῆνσος here ſpoken of was to be paid in a certain ſpecies of Mony, *viz.* in *Denarii*, which had the image of the *Cæſars* impreſſed upon them, as was conjectured by *Marq. Freberus*.

Verſ. 44. *Note* b.] The Phraſe ὑστερήματα θλίψεων τῦ Χριςῦ, *Coloſ.* i. 24. is, what remained for St. *Paul* to ſuffer for the ſake of *Chriſt*, as I have ſhewn in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. *Sect.* 1. *cap.* xii.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 32. *Note* b. IT is no wonder that it is ſo hard to underſtand wherein the Hereſy of the *Agnoetæ* lay, becauſe if it was their Opinion that *Jeſus*, i. e. the *Man* that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was ignorant of any thing, it is manifeſt that they were of the ſame opinion with our *Saviour* himſelf, who could not have affirmed this more plainly; but if they aſſerted that *God* alſo who dwelt in the human Nature of *Chriſt*, knew not when the day of Judgment, was to be; ſuch an Abſurdity as this hardly any but mad Men could be guilty of. For my part, I am apt to think that the *Grecians* at that time were mightily given to be contentious, and falſly attributed Opinions to one another which they diſowned, and were unwilling to underſtand themſelves. Some have been inclined to think the ſame as to the buſineſs of *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius*, who differed from one another and the reſt of Chriſtians more in Words than in Things. It is plain the *Greeks* took no care at all to ſpeak their mind clearly in theſe matters, and a contentious humour might eaſily make them miſtake one anothers ſenſe. But this is not a place to treat of this matter in. Chapter XIII.

CHAP. XIV.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. THere are ſome things in this *laſt* Note that may lead the Reader into a miſtake, which I ſhall therefore briefly confute.

I. If *Nard* were a dry Ointment, yet it might as eaſily be contained in a Marble or Alabaſter Box as if it were liquid. Do not ἀλείμματα or *dry Ointments* uſe to be put in ſuch ſort of Veſſels for the better preſervation of them? This every body knows that has but once been in an Apothecary's Shop.

II. *Nard* is not always liquid. There was a liquider and a thicker ſort of it, as *Dioſcorides* informs us, *Mat. Med.* lib. 1. *cap.* lxxv. where having deſcribed the manner of making this Ointment, he ſays; ὑγρὸς δὲ ἐστι, καὶ ὡ γλειώδης, ἐὰν μὴ ῥητίνην ἔχῃ: *it is liquid, and not thick like dregs unleſs it have gum in it.* Now nothing hinders but that the Ointment which St. *Mark* here ſpeaks of might have gum mixed with it, and ſo be a *thicker* ſort of Nard, which might eaſily alſo be if it had been a great while kept.

III. Our *Author* deſcribes a ſort of Nard unknown to all Antiquity, who never reckoned Nard among the σμυρνὰ. None of the Antients, and perhaps no one Modern Author beſides Dr. *Hammond*, ever ſpake thus, who ſeems to have confounded *Nard* with *Myrrh*. Nard is an *Herb* of an indifferent bigneſs, as *Dioſcorides* lib. 1. *cap.* vi, and viii. and *Pliny* lib. 12. *cap.* xii. tell us. The words of *Pliny* are theſe: *De folio Nardi plura dici par eſt, ut principali in unguentis. Frutex eſt gravi & craſſa radice, ſed brevi ac nigra fragilique —— folio parvo, denſoque, Cacumina in ariſtas ſe ſpargunt; ideo gemina dote, Nardi ſpicas ac folia celebrant. Of the leaf of the Herb Nard more ought to be ſaid, as that which has the principal place in Ointments. It is a Plant that has a thick and heavy Root, but a ſhort black and brittle one —— its Leaf is ſmall and thick, the top of it is bearded; Nard therefore is famous both for the virtue of its ſpikes and leaves.* So he deſcribes the *Indian* Nard, and having mentioned other kinds of it, adds; *Sunt autem omnia herbæ, præter Indicam; they are all Herbs, except that which comes from* India. Of theſe leaves, or the ſpikes bruiſed together and mixed with Oil and other Spices, the Ointment of Nard was made, and not of any Liquor which is diſtilled from them. This appears alſo from *Dioſcorides*, lib. 1. *cap.* lxxv. and from *Pliny* lib. 13. *cap.* i. Our *Author* ſeems again to have confounded *Nard* with *Myrrh*, which makes an Ointment of it ſelf without Oil, as *Pliny* tells us. He confounds alſo the word

word *Nard*, as that ſignifies either the *Plant* before deſcribed, or the *Ointment* which is made of it; for the Plant indeed is called *ſpicata Nardus*, becauſe of its ſpiked leaves, but not the *Ointment* which was called *unguentum ſpicatum*, or *unguentum Nardi ſpicatæ*, not *Nardus ſpicata*, viz. becauſe the *ſpike* was the principal Ingredient in that Ointment, which Name was given to *Nard* by way of eminence. See *Salmaſius* upon *Solinus*, p. 750. *Ed. Ultraj.* about this matter. Chapter XIV.

IV. The Phraſe *pura Nardus*, *pure Nard*, in *Tibullus* does not ſignify, as the *Doctor* thinks, Ointment made *only* of Nard, or the juice of Nard, but that which was called *Ointment of Nard*, in which beſides other Spices there was *pure Nard*, i. e. not adulterated, as it frequently was, as *Dioſcorides* and *Pliny* tell us. And this Ointment it is that St. *Mark* calls νάρδ& πιστὴ, i. e. *Nard faithfully made* or *prepared*, ſuch as had *true unſophiſticated Nard* in it, which was the reaſon of its being πολυτελὴς *of great price*. *Pliny* lib. 12. *cap.* 12. *Pretium ſpicæ in libras* x. c. *Folii deviſere annonam, ab amplitudine hadroſphærium vocatur, majoribus foliis*, x. xxx. &c. *The price of Nard is* x. c. *a pound. The difference in the bigneſs of the Leaves made a difference in the price; that which had the biggeſt Leaves was called* Hadroſphærium, *and the price of it was* x. xxx.

V. The *Ointment* of Nard cannot be called *Nardus ſpicata*, but the *Plant* only; and therefore *Grotius* is miſtaken when he ſays that πιστὴ and *ſpicata* are the ſame. Tho πιστὸν, for that which we expreſs by *faithfully made*, is none of the beſt *Greek*, yet it is poſſible that thoſe whoſe trade it was to make Ointments, the *Apothecaries* or *Perfumers*, might uſe it in that ſenſe; and that St. *Mark* made uſe of their terms, eſpecially where he ſpeaks of their Commodities, ought not to ſeem ſtrange. Conſult alſo *Salmaſius* in the place before-mentioned.

Ibid. *Note* b.] I grant the Verb συντρίβω does not ſignify always *to break*, when the diſcourſe is about a thing which may be hurt without being broken, as about a *wounded Man*, or a *bruiſed Reed*; but where the diſcourſe is about a *Veſſel*, and eſpecially ſuch an one as is made of *brittle* matter, it has ever that ſignification: and whoever ſays, συντρίβειν σκεῦ& μαρμάρινον ἢ ὕαλινον, it muſt be rendered *to break a Marble or Glaſs Veſſel*. See *Levit.* vi. 28. xi. 33. xv. 12. *Rev.* ii. 27. And thoſe that endeavour to put any other ſenſe upon that Phraſe here, ſtrain it. Dr. *Hammond*'s two firſt Reaſons for another Interpretation I have confuted already in a Note upon the parallel place in St. *Matthew*. The third, together with the reſt, are, I ſuppoſe, taken out of *Baronius*, and relie upon a nauſeous Fable which is related in the following words by *Suidas*, whom, if our *Author* had but look'd

Chapter XIV. into, I believe he would never have made use of this Testimony. Thus *Suidas* tells the story in φῆφος, out of some unknown Fable-maker, as he used to do. Κατωθεν τῆς καχρυλίνου ἐκρέμοντο δύο τρεμπελὶ, (or rather ταυρεὶ Crosses, as *Æmil. Portus* has observed) ἐφ' ὧν δύο λῃστῶν, καὶ βίκιον μύρου ἐν ᾧ ἐνεκρίθη ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα σημειωτικὰ, τοῦτο μὲν ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου, ἀφανισθέντα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοδοσίου: *under the Market-place were buried the two Crosses of the two Thieves, and the little Ointment Pot out of which Christ was anointed, and many other remarkable things that were laid there by* Constantine *the Great, but taken away by* Theodosius *the Great.* *Suidas* does not give the least intimation that he thought this silly Fable to be true; he only tells it, as he does many others, as he had read it. And therefore the Consequences that the *Doctor* draws from his Authority and Learning are insignificant. Nay, tho *Suidas* had said that he believed this Fable, yet it would be much more likely that he had either forgot this Passage in St. *Mark*, or that it did not come into his mind, than that he thought the Phrase συντεῖσαι σκεῦος to signify any thing different from what I have said it does.

Neither is there any more weight in the *Argument* which our *Author* grounds upon a Passage out of *Pollux*, because the Phrase συντεῖσαι ἀλάβαστρον cannot signify *to open the Cruise* and stir the Ointment about with a *Spathula*, or Slice. All the rest that he says is manifestly besides the cause, because he considers the *Verb* συντεῖσαι *abstractly*, not as it is *joined* with the name of a brittle Vessel; nor have I leisure to examine every thing particularly. I conclude therefore that this Phrase is rightly translated in the vulgar Latin *fracto alabastro*. See what I have said on the parallel place in St. *Matthew*.

Vers. 54. *Note* f.] What our *Author* says about the words πῦρ & φῶς he seems to have borrowed from *Dan. Heinsius*; who may be consulted by those that have leisure.

Vers. 72. *Note* i.] The *Participle* ἐμβαλὼν ought not to be separated by a *Comma* from the following word, which is the Verb to that as its Nominative Case. The opinion of *Grotius* which is by our *Author* mentioned in the *second* place, is the most probable. The Verb ἐμβαλεῖν alone does not signify to *see* or *look upon*, but only when the Noun τὰς ὄψεις, or some other like that is added to it, and εἰς τινα or τινὶ for the most part follows. I am apt to think that in the place cited out of *Phavorinus* we ought after ἐμβάλλω to read εἰς τόνδε, because ἐμβάλλειν τινὰ for *to look upon any one*, is no Greek Phrase; and ὄψεις also must be understood, ἐμβάλλω εἰς τόνδε τὰς ὄψεις.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Verſ. 6. Απίλυον] That is, εἰώθει ἀπολύειν, *he uſed to releaſe*, as it is in St. *Matthew* Chap. xxvii. 15. After this manner the *future* Tenſe in *Hebrew*, and the *aoriſt* in *Greek*, and the *preterperfect* in Latin is many times uſed. See my Index to the *Pentateuch* upon the word *futurum*, and *Rom.* viii. 29, 30.

Verſ. 8. Ἀναβοήσας] In ſome *Manuſcripts* it is ἀναβᾶς, the reaſon of which is not, as *Grotius* thought, that ſome Greek Copies of this Goſpel were altered to make them agree with the Latin Verſion; for beſides the *Vatican* mentioned by him (but omitted in the *Oxford Edit.* of the New Teſtament) and the Manuſcript that was ſent by *Beza* to *Cambridg*, the Copy alſo which thoſe that made the Coptick and Gothick Tranſlations uſed read it ſo, which it is plain could never have it from the Latin Verſions. If we admit this reading, the ſenſe will not be inconvenient. *And the multitude going up* (into the Hall) *began to deſire*, &c.

Verſ. 17. *Note* a.] Concerning thoſe things in this Hiſtory which relate to the *Roman Cuſtoms*, we muſt read the Philological Notes of that learned Lawyer *Edm. Merillus* upon the *Paſſion*; who has treated of this matter on ſet purpoſe. Add alſo what I have ſaid about this place in St. *Matthew*.

Verſ. 33. Τρεμάσης δὲ ὥρας ἕκτης] This is very well expreſſed by our Author in agreement with the *Roman Cuſtom*, in his Paraphraſe. For they uſed as in the night, ſo alſo in the day time, to give notice what hour it was by the ſound of a Trumpet. This appears from a Paſſage in *Lucan*, lib. 2. ver. 689. where, ſpeaking of *Pompey*'s flight, he deſcribes him forbidding *ne buccina dividat horas*, that his flight might be the more ſecret.

Verſ. 42. Παρασκευὴ, ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον] This Interpretation of the word παρασκευὴ is added for the ſake of the *uncircumciſed* Gentiles who were ignorant of the *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms. Every *Friday*, or προσάββατον, was ſo called, as *Bochart* in concurrence with others before him tells us, *Hieroz.* P. 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 50. p. 567. And not only the *Jews*, but *Chriſtians* alſo afterwards made uſe of that word παρασκευὴ. See *Grotius* upon *Luke* xviii. 11.

Verſ. 43. *Note* d.] I rather think that by Βουλευτὴς we are to underſtand that dignity that *Joſeph* was in among the Jews, by being one of the *Sanhedrim* of LXXII Men, or the *leſſer* of xxiii. For *Arimathæa* was not a Roman Colony.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Verſ. 18. *Note* c. I Will not undertake here to examine whether thoſe antient and true *Sibyls* did foretel any thing concerning *Chriſt*; but I ſhall obſerve that no ſuch thing can be inferred from thoſe Verſes of *Virgil*: for it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the ſenſe of that *Sybil*'s words are ſo expreſſed by *Virgil*, as to have no addition made to them. Perhaps the *Sybil* had propheſied that after the tenth Age, which was that of the Sun, there ſhould be another Golden Age; and that Saying alone gave *Virgil* occaſion enough to deſcribe that new Age, juſt like that Golden one which was ſaid by the *Poets* to have been in the Reign of *Saturn*. And it was only in the *Silver* Age, as they tell us, that Serpents became poiſonous, which in the Golden Age had no Poiſon. This we are told, to go no farther, by *Virgil* himſelf, *Georg.* 1. ver. 128.

Ille (viz. Jupiter) *malum virus ſerpentibus addidit atris.*

Verſ. 19. Ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.] *Grotius* has very well obſerved, that this form of Speech is borrowed from the Cuſtom of *Kings*, who uſe to command thoſe whom they have a mind to confer the higheſt Honour upon, to ſit at their right-hand. See his Notes upon *Mat.* xx. 21. The *Greek* Poets ſpeak alſo in the ſame manner concerning the *Heathen Gods*, as that great man has ſhewed by an Example out of *Pindar*. And, if you pleaſe, you may add this out of *Callimachus* about *Apollo*, in his Hymn conſecrated to that God, *ver.* 28.

Τὸν χορὸν ὦ πολλοὶ ὅτι οἱ χάριν θυμὸν ἀείδῃ
Τιμήσῃ, δύναται γάρ, ἐπὶ Διὶ ΔΕΞΙΟΣ ΗΣΤΑΙ.

Apollo will honour this Quire, becauſe it ſings to pleaſe him; for he is able, ſince he ſits at Jupiter's right-hand.

But this might by the Poets, who fancied their Gods to be in the ſhape of men, be underſtood *properly*: the difficulty is, how S. *Mark*, who had quite another Notion of *God*, underſtood this Phraſe ἐκαθίσθη ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. *Interpreters* tells us that it is a Metaphor, and muſt be underſtood to ſignify only the great Glory to which *Chriſt* was exalted, and nothing more. And it is certain, that this Expreſſion of *the right hand of God*, if by *God* we underſtand the *divine Nature* conſidered in it ſelf, muſt needs be metaphorical; but is it not ſomething

thing odd that a *Chriſtian* Hiſtorian ſhould in a naked account of things make uſe of ſuch a Metaphor? So it will ſeem, if I am not miſtaken, to thoſe that attentively conſider it. And therefore perhaps (for I affirm nothing poſitively) we ought rather by the Word *God* to underſtand a *Light inacceſſible* to any but *Chriſt*, which is a Symbol of the divine Preſence, and on the right ſide of which he, whom the Father hath made King of Heaven and Earth, ſits. And this is that which the *Martyr Stephen* ſeems to have ſeen when he beheld δόξαν θεῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τῦ θεῦ, *the glory of God, and Jeſus ſtanding on the right hand of God*, viz. of that inacceſſible Light or Glory; of which ſee my Notes upon *Exod.* xxxiv. 18. For without doubt, properly ſpeaking he did not ſee *God*; and to ſay that when it is affirmed of him that he ſaw *Jeſus on the right hand of God*, the meaning is, that he ſaw him in the enjoyment or poſſeſſion of the higheſt Glory, is harſh and unnatural. See alſo *Matth.* xxvi. 2. and *Mark* xiv. 62. Let the Learned conſider whether this be not what the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* alſo intended in *Chap.* xii. 2. where he ſays, that *Jeſus is ſet down at the right hand of God.* I have not time at preſent to proſecute theſe things at large: Which I mention, leſt the Reader ſhould think that I had too ſlightly paſſed over a Subject which deſerves to have a great many Thoughts ſpent upon it. Chapter XVI.

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *Luke*.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. IT might have been ſaid without any more ado, that the verb πληροφορῶν ſignifies *to certify*, or *aſſure*, and is properly ſpoken of *perſons*. Thus in the collections of *Cteſias* Cap. xxxviii. πολλοῖς τῶν λόγοις καὶ ὅρκοις πληροφόσαντες Μεγάβυζον: *having by many words and oaths aſſured Megabizus*. So in *Socrates Orat. Trapezit.* pag. 360. *Ed. H. Steph.* ἐμὲ δ' πολλῶν ἀκόντων ξύλον πληροφορηθὲς γεγονῶναι μηδὲν λαπῆσαι: *when he knew for certain that I had in the hearing of a great many witneſſes denied that I had any thing.* And from hence the word being applied to *things*, πληροφορήμενα ſignifies ſuch things which we are ſure are true, as in this place in St. *Luke*, as the following words ſhew. Πληροφορῆσθαι no where ſignifies *to come to paſs*, or *to be fulfilled*, where the Diſcourſe is concerning a *Prophecy*. II. Πληροφορεῖν ἐπιθυμίαν is *to comply with* or *ſatisfy a deſire*; for ſo the verb πληροφορέω alſo ſignifies. As in the *old Gloſſes*; πληροφορῶ *morigero, ſatisfacio.* Agreable hereto is the *Latin* phraſe *explere animum, libidinem*, &c. And which is much to the ſame ſenſe, the Greek διακονίαν πληροφορεῖν ſignifies to fulfil his truſt or office, which the *Latins* expreſs by *implere partes officii ſui, numeros omnes implere.* III. Πληροφορῶν is often of the ſame ſignification with the *ſimple* verb πληρῶν, and πληροφορία with πλήρης. And in the *old Gloſſes* πληροφόρημα alſo is rendred by *plenitudo, ſatisfactio, fulneſs, ſatisfaction.* What is further obſervable about this word, Dr. *Hammond* has here ſet down.

Verſ. 2. *Note* b.] I. The ὑπηρέται λόγου are thoſe which have fulfilled their office of preaching the Goſpel, purſuant to *Chriſt*'s Command. The word λόγος is often taken for the *Goſpel*. See *Act.* iv. 4, &c. In the ſame phraſe almoſt the office of ſuch Perſons is deſcribed by St. *Luke* in *Act.* vi. 4. where he calls it διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου the *miniſtry of the word*

word or *Goſpel.* II. The reaſon why St. *John* calls *the Godhead dwelling bodily* in *Chriſt*, by the name of λόγος, I have ſhewn in my *Animadverſions* upon St. *John*, Chap. i. 1. I cannot tell whether our Author thought that the *Chaldee Paraphraſts* lived before *Chriſt*'s time; but there are a great many things in them, which make it probable that they are of a later date. Beſides, the Phraſe מימר יי *the word of the Lord*, which is ſo often uſed by them, does not ſignify a diſtinct ὑπόστασις or *ſubſiſtence*, as has been ſhewn by a learned man in a Diſcourſe intitled *de ſermone Dei cujus creberrima ſit mentio apud Paraphraſtas Chaldæos*; tho I am not in all things of his opinion. III. In what ſenſe the word λόγος was known to the antient Heathens, I have ſhewed in the forementioned *Animadverſions*, out of older Authors than *Amelius*. *Amelius*'s Teſtimony is extant in *Euſebius* Præp. Evang. *Lib.* xi. cap. 9. Chapter I.

Verſ. 27. *Note.* f.] Our learned Author truſting too much to his memory, vainly contends that the prepoſition ב in *Malachi* iv. 6. ought to be rendered *with*, not *to*; for it is the prepoſition על and not ב that is uſed in that place of *Malachi*, *and he ſhall turn the fathers* על *upon* or *to the children, and the heart of the children* על *upon* or *to their fathers*. It ſeems to be a proverbial form of ſpeech, to ſignify that *John* was to call the *Jews*, who were at very great *variance* among themſelves, to agreement and *concord*. Our Saviour, that he might repreſent the great diſſenſions that were occaſioned by the variety of mens opinions about matters of Religion, ſpeaks in this manner, *Matt.* x. 21. *The brother ſhall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children ſhall riſe up againſt their parents and kill them*; and verſe 35. *I am come to ſet a man at variance againſt his father, and the daughter againſt the mother.* Now to ſhew that *John* was to extinguiſh all ſuch animoſities, or at leaſt uſe the propereſt means to that end, the *Prophet* made uſe juſt of a *contrary* expreſſion, and ſaid, *he ſhall turn the heart of the fathers, &c.* This is by two *Evangeliſts* called *the reſtoring of all things*, and here by the Angel *turning the diſobedient to the ſentiments of the juſt*; and indeed, the *Jews* could not be reclaimed from their diſſenſions, and diſpoſed to ſubmit to one Maſter *Jeſus Chriſt*, unleſs *John* had been to make it his endeavour to *reſtore* the whole Jewiſh Nation, and to bring them over to the φρόνησις mind or *opinion of the juſt*. See *Grotius* on *Malach.* and this place in St. *Mark*. The Doctor here takes abundance of pains to interpret this place, to little purpoſe, becauſe he had not looked into the words of *Malachi*. He repreſents the Prophet ſpeaking the ſame thing over and over, like him that ſaid:

Semivirúmque bovem, ſemibovémque virum.

For what elſe but a nauſeous Tautology are thoſe words, *old and young, young and old?* But that which the Prophet ſays, is, that *John* ſhould endeavour to turn *the hearts of the fathers to the children*, i. e. the fathers who were *miſtaken* in their *Opinions*, to the Children who had *righter apprehenſions* of things; and *the hearts of the children to the fathers*, or the erroneous Children to the judgment of their Fathers, who embraced the true Doctrine of *Chriſt*; in a word, to bring ἀπειθῶν ἐπὶ φρόνησιν δικαίων *the incredulous and diſobedient to be of the mind or ſentiments of the juſt.*

II. The word φρόνησις I render *mind* or ſentiment, and not *Wiſdom*, becauſe that is the moſt uſual ſignification of the word, and agreable to the common acceptation of the primitive φρονεῖν for *ſentire* to *think*, or be of ſuch a ſentiment, as it is uſed by St. *Paul* in *Phil.* ii. 2. where the Phraſes τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, and τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν, ſignify *to think the ſame thing, to be of the ſame mind.* And my reaſon for this is, becauſe the Diſcourſe here is περὶ τῆς συμφρονήσεως, the conſent of the *Jews* who diſagreed among themſelves. But then it muſt not be thought that by *ſententiam, ſentiment*, I underſtand the ſame with δόξα *a ſpeculation* or opinion, which entertains only the *underſtanding*, but an *affection* or diſpoſition of the Soul, which diſcovers it ſelf in external actions, and is that vertue which the Latins uſually call *prudentia*, as the Greeks φρόνησις. And this was the reaſon it may be, why the *Evangeliſt* rather made uſe of the word φρόνησις, than δόξα; for φρόνησις is properly neither *ſententia opinion*, nor *prudentia prudence* or *wiſdom*; but *an affection of the Soul*, by which we not only think and judg, but alſo love and hate. See *H. Stephens Theſaur.* upon the word φρονεῖν.

Verſ. 28. *Note* k.] I. For the underſtanding of what is meant by κεχαριτωμένη in this place, it muſt be enquired not what Noun χάρις, but what the Verb χαριτόω ſignifies, and particularly in the *New Teſtament.* And we find this verb χαριτόω uſed by St. *Paul* in a very clear notion, in *Eph.* i. 6. where he ſays that *God has predeſtinated us to the adoption of children, by Jeſus Chriſt, to the praiſe of the glory of his grace,* εἰς ἣν ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, *in which he hath gratified us in the beloved*, i. e. by which he hath dealt moſt bountifully with us through *Chriſt.* And agreably hereto the meaning of the Angel here muſt be: "O Virgin, "who art highly favoured by God. *Phavorinus* renders κεχαριτωμένη by πεφιλημένη, ἠυλογημένη, *beloved, bleſſed.*

II.

II. What our Author quotes out of *Heſychius*, relates rather to the *body*, or to *elegancy* of ſpeech, than tothe *Mind*, which certainly we can have nothing to do with here. Thus χαείντα he interprets by καλὰ and κεχαεστωμένα *pretty, elegant ſayings*. And the *old Onomaſticon*, κεχαεστωμένος facetus, *gratioſus, witty, pleaſant*. In which ſenſe it is taken in the *Son of Siracb* Chap. xviii. 19. where the diſcourſe is concerning one that was well skilled in the art of *ſpeaking*, or an *eloquent* man. The word κεχαεσμένος in *Heſychius* ought not to be changed into κεχαεστωμένος. The *old Gloſſes* have that word, and render it by *gratus, gratuitus, acceptus, grateful, freely beſtowed, acceptable*. But χαεῖς is undoubtedly, as the *Doctor* ſuppoſes, a falſe print for χάεισος. Chapter I.

III. The Phraſe אשת חן γυνὴ ἐχάεισσα in *Prov.* xi. 16. ſignifies a *handſom Woman*; for which ſenſe there can be no room here.

Verſ. 39. *Note* m.] Of this Phraſe *in thoſe days*, ſee my Notes on *Gen.* xxxviii. 1.

Verſ. 67. *Note* n. *at the end of the* third *ſenſe of the word* ἀντιδίδων *pag.* 190. *lin.* 24.] I. Our Author had done well, if he had produced the words of thoſe Grammarians who ſay that ἀντὶ ὑπὲρ ſignifies naturally no more than one that ſpeaks ἀντὶ ὑπὲρ, *for* or *in the ſtead of another*. And he might have ſhewn us too at the ſame time, that ἀντὶ in compoſition is the ſame ſometime with ὑπὲρ or ἀντὶ, as *pro* in Latin in *Proconſul*. For as for me, I know of no Grammarian that has proved this, but I know of one that thinks them both falſe. When Poets are ſaid to be the ἀντῶντες or ὑπηρέται of the *Muſes*, it is not meant that they ſpeak in the *place* or *ſtead of the Muſes*, but by their inſpiration, no leſs than *Prophets* by the inſpiration of that particular *Deity* to which they are conſecrated. For it muſt be obſerved, that tho the word ἀντὶς properly ſignifies one who foretels things to come, yet when *Poets* are ſo ſtiled, it ſignifies only men inſpired by the Muſes. Which is the reaſon alſo, why Poets uſed to invoke them.

II. Amongſt the Heathens, the *Divines*, *Prophets* or *Prieſts*, did not teach the People how they were to *live*, but only the manner of *worſhipping* and pacifying the *Gods*. And therefore *Lactantius* Lib. v. c. 3. ſpeaking of the Heathen Divinity, very truly ſaith: *Nihil ibi diſſeritur quod proficiat ad mores excolendos, vitamque formandam, nec habet inquiſitionem aliquam veritatis, ſed tantummodò ritum colendi. That it does not in the leaſt teach men how to live, nor give any rules how to find out the Truth, but declares only in what manner and with what ceremonies the Gods are to be worſhipped.* It was the buſineſs of the *Philoſophers* to teach thoſe things which related to Peoples *Manners*, as the ſame Author obſerves. *Philoſophia*, ſays he, & *religio Deorum disjuncta ſunt, longeque diſcreta.*

Chapter I.

diſcreta. Siquidem alii ſunt profeſſores ſapientiæ, per quos utique ad Deos non aditur; alii Religionis Antiſtites, per quos ſapere non diſcitur; apparet nec illam eſſe veram ſapientiam, nec hanc Religionem. Philoſophy and the worſhip of the Gods are two very different things among the Heathens. For their Profeſſors of Wiſdom are one ſort of men, who teach nothing that relates to divine worſhip, and their Prieſts another ſort, which give men no inſtructions how to grow wiſer. But it is manifeſt, that neither the former is true Wiſdom, nor the latter true divine Worſhip.

III. As for *Epimenides*, who wrote no books of *Ethicks*, but rather taught the way of *purifying* or *expiating*, I know not why our Author ſhould deny him to have been a Foreteller of things to come, merely becauſe of *Ariſtotle*'s ſingle Teſtimony, and thereupon argue that he was not for that reaſon called a *Prophet*. For others do affirm him to have been skilful in the art of Divination, and produce ſome inſtances to that purpoſe. See *Laertius* Lib. i. Sect. 114. and his *Interpreter*. And we have no reaſon to ſuppoſe but that St. *Paul* might rather have a reſpect to the *general* Opinion than to *Ariſtotle*'s.

Ibid. After the *4th ſenſe given of that word*, pag. 190. *lin.* 29.] When the verb προφητεύω ſignifies to *interpret* Scripture, or *exhort* the People to Virtue, or *both*, it ought not to be rendered by *propheſying* or *foretelling*, which is its moſt uſual ſignification, but by *preaching* or *ſpeaking publickly*. And the reaſon of this is, becauſe the Prepoſition πρὸ is ambiguous, and does not only ſignify *ante before*, when it is referred to *time*; but alſo when the Diſcourſe is about *things* and Perſons, *i. e. propè* or *coram*, *nigh to*, or *in the preſence of*; which laſt ſignification it manifeſtly has in many compound words. Thus προάγω is *producere*, *provehere*, *to bring forth*, *to carry on*; προαίρω, *promere*, *proferre*, *to bring out*, *to produce*; προβαίνω, *progredior*, *procedo*, *to go forward*, *to proceed*; προκόπτω, *promoveo*, *provehо*, *to put forward*, *to lead on*; προγεγραμμα, *proſcriptum*, *a publick order poſted up in writing*; προγράφω, *proſcribo*, *profiteor*, *to publiſh*, *to profeſs*, with many more which may be had out of any *Lexicon*. I have tranſcribed theſe out of the *old Gloſſaries* of *Philoxenus* and others, and to tranſcribe more was needleſs. It cannot therefore ſeem ſtrange to any, if we interpret this verb προφητεύω by *proloqui* to *utter* or *pronounce*, which is rendered in the old *Onomaſticon* by προλαλῶ, and accordingly call him a Prophet who *delivers* or *pronounces a pious diſcourſe* in a Church Aſſembly. It is certain that the word προφήτης is uſed thus in *Lucian* in *Auct. Vitarum*, where *Diogenes* is repreſented as giving this ſhort Character of himſelf, that he was one who took it to be his province publickly to teach Vertue, and inveigh againſt Vice: τὸ δ' ὅλον, ſaith he, ἀληθείας καὶ παῤῥησίας ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ εἶναι βούλο-

βολημαι, *in ſhort, I am reſolved to be a* PROPHET *of truth, and liberty of ſpeech*; i. e. to ſpeak freely whatever I think to be true and juſt. I confeſs, *Diogenes* ſeems here to have taken Ἀλήθεια and Παῤῥησία for two *Goddeſſes* by whom he was inſpired; but then it was only in order to this end, that he might boldly ſpeak the truth concerning mens *manners*, and not that he might *foretel* things to come. This is the ſenſe in which the Verb προφητεύειν is uſed by *Ariſtotle* in lib. *de mundo*, where he ſpeaks thus concerning Philoſophy: ῥᾳδίως, εἶμαι, τὴ συγχωρῆ γνωσόμενα, καὶ θείῳ ψυχῆς ὄμματι τὰ θεῖα καταλαβόντα, τοῖς τε ἀνθρώποις προφητεύσαντα: *underſtanding, I ſuppoſe, eaſily things agreable to her nature, and comprehending divine things with the divine eye of her mind, and declaring them to men.* In this place alſo there is a reſpect had to *inſpiration*, but not ſuch a one as has any relation to the knowledg of things future. Theſe two paſſages were not underſtood by *H. Stephanus*. Becauſe therefore the Genius and uſe of the Greek language would admit preachers to be called προφῆται, St. *Paul* made uſe of this word; and ſo much the more willingly, becauſe therein he did not depart from the cuſtom of his Country-men the *Jews*; among whom it was a Prophet's office not only to *foretel* things to come, but alſo to *teach* the People Piety and Vertue. The *Egyptians* alſo had their προφῆται; but that they propheſied, or confer'd with the People about their manners, is not known. Chapter I.

Ibid. *under the 6th ſenſe of that word.*] See my Notes upon the paſſage cited by the *Doctor* out of *Numbers*.

Verſ. 70. *Note* p.] I. The learned *Jac. Rhenferdius* has written a Diſcourſe very well worth our reading about this phraſe, *ſæculum præſens & futurum, the preſent and future age*; in which he aſſerts that the Phraſe עולם הבא *the age to come*, was uſed in antient times, and ſo in the time of *Chriſt*, to ſignify only the *next life*, and not the age of the *Meſſias*. And indeed all the examples brought by the *Doctor* do confirm this very thing; nor is there any clear place alledged by him out of the New Teſtament, which puts the contrary out of doubt. One or two paſſages in a late *Rabbin* ought not to be taken for a certain proof of what was the cuſtom and doctrine of the Antient *Jews*.

II. The interpretation which the *Doctor* gives of the phraſe לעולם ועד עולם appears to be ingenious at firſt ſight; but if it be narrowly examined, it will be found inconſiſtent with the uſe of the Hebrew language. For as the Phraſe לדור ודור *to age and to age* ſignifies nothing but *to all future ages*; ſo the meaning of that other is no more than, *for ever*. It is a Hebraiſm, wherein the ſame word is repeated to expreſs all that ſuch or ſuch a word ſignifies. And thus איש איש *man, man*, is uſed to ſignify *every man*.

III.

Chapter I.

III. The Gospel is called αἰώνιον, *eternal*, because it will never be made void by any other Covenant or Dispensation, as the Law had been. It has no relation at all to the Phrase *the present or future age.*

IV. The Phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων is a Hebraism likewise, such another as לרור דורים *to age of ages*, that is, *perpetually*, or to the very last age.

Vers. 73. *Note* q.] What is said here about the allusion of this whole passage to the names of *John* and his Parents, is a meer trifle, only fit for an Allegorist to say, not for a serious and exact Interpreter, such as *Grotius*, from whom the *Doctor* took this remark. Our Author supposes, with others, that the name of *Zacharias*'s wife was אלישבע *Elisebebah*; but if that had been her name, she should have been called in Greek Ἐλισαβὲ or Ἐλισαβὲθ. Nor do I see why her name might not have been אלישבט *Elisebebat*, *my God is a Scepter*, or אלישברת *Elisebebath*, *my God is rest.*

Ibid. *Note* r.] The word ἀφόβως must undoubtedly be joyned with λατρεύειν, as *Grotius* righly thought; nor can any thing be imagined more harsh, than this Phrase ῥυσθῆναι ἀφόβως *to be delivered without fear*; whereas ἀφόβως λατρεύειν θεῷ *to serve God without fear* is a Phrase that every body will acknowledg to be proper when the enemies of Gods worship are so punished and kept under by him as to be incapable of hindring his being openly and publickly worshipped. But that which made our learned *Author* suppose that the *Evangelist* made use of so *harsh* a Phrase was the difficulty of understanding what *deliverance* was here properly spoken of, considering the *primary* notion of the words. *Zacharias* here speaks concerning the Kingdom of the *Messias* as the Prophets generally did, *viz.* as of a deliverance of the Jews from the dangers that hung over them from their enemies. At the time when *Zacharias* spake these words, the *Syrians*, *Egyptians* and other Heathen Nations that bordered upon *Judæa*, bore the *Jews* such a grudg, and were such troublesom neighbours to them, that they could not exercise their Religion ἀφόβως *without fear*, where the Heathens were more numerous than themselves, nor go up to *Jerusalem* to offer Sacrifice without danger. Nay, they were not without some fears and jealousies of the *Romans* themselves, lest being blinded with superstition they should some time or other oppose the Worship of the true *God*, as afterwards they often did. *Zacharias* therefore speaks of the *Messias* as of one that was about to rescue the *Jews* from these dangers, in agreement with the common opinion; nor did the Spirit of Prophecy undeceive him as to this matter, and the proper sense of his words is this which

I have mentioned. But in a more *sublime* ſenſe, this deliverance is to be underſtood in general of the Enemies of Chriſtianity, who were in time to be converted to the Chriſtian Religion, ſo that thoſe who were before a terrour to the Chriſtians, ſhould enter themſelves into *Chriſt's* ſheepfold, and ſet the Chriſtians free from all their fears, which came to paſs only in the time of *Conſtantine*. It was then and not before that πᾶσα ὑποψία ἀμφιδολίας τῆς φόβου ἐκκρέμβη, *all ſuſpicion, miſgiving and fear was taken away from the Chriſtians*, as it is ſaid in the Edict of *Conſtantine*, extant in *Euſebius* Hiſt. Eccleſ. *Lib.* ix. c. 10. Τὰ δ' τῆς δυσσεβείας καὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐχθρῶν ἀκρότης ἐς ἀτιμίας ἐκάτης ἐπεπήκατο: *and the ſide of the wicked was filled with the higheſt degree of ſhame and diſhonour by the piety of their enemies*; as *Euſebius* expreſſes himſelf in the next Chapter. Theſe ſeem to be the Enemies here ſpoken of. Chapter II.

II. The paſſage cited by the *Doctor* out of *Prov.* i. 33. in the *Greek* tranſlation, will not prove that ἐυσταθῶν ἀφόβως is a proper Phraſe, for theſe are *Wiſdoms* words: *But whoſo hearkeneth unto me, ſhall dwell ſafely, and at peace, and free from fear of evil*, which the *Septuagint* render by ἐυηχήσει ἀφόβως ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ, that is, *he ſhall fear no evil*. The reſt of the paſſages which he compares with this place in St. *Luke*, are foreign to the purpoſe.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. I. *Note* b. OF this paſſage in St. *Luke*, the learned *Jac. Perizonius* has treated in a particular Diſcourſe by it ſelf, wherein he has confuted Dr. *Hammond* and others opinion at large, and, if I am not miſtaken, ſolidly. He affirms that St. *Luke*'s words in the 2 *verſe* ought to be rendred thus: *hæc deſcriptio ante facta eſt, quam præeſſet Syriæ Quirinus, this enrolling was made before Quirinus was Governour of Syria*; and having examined his reaſons, I freely ſubſcribe to them, and refer the Reader to the *Diſcourſe* it ſelf.

II. Our Author has committed a great miſtake in his paraphraſe upon the 2 *verſe*, where he tells us that at that time, *i. e.* in the reign of *Herod* the Great, *Palæſtine was under Syria*; whereas it is moſt certain that the King of *Judæa* had no dependence upon the Proconſul of *Syria*, and that *Judæa* was not *a province*, at that time. This appears evidently from *Joſephus* Antiq. Jud. *Lib.* xviii. c. 1. where he tells us that *Judæa* was not made a Province till after *Archelaus*'s baniſhment. But perhaps our Learned Author fell into the ſame Miſtake with *Euſebius*, who ſays that *Joſephus* made mention of the ſame regiſtring which St. *Luke* here ſpeaks of, becauſe he affirmed it to have been made by *Quirinus*, whoſe name is mentioned by St. *Luke*; for which miſtake nevertheleſs,

Chapter II. theleſs, he has long ſince been corrected by learned Men. The paſſage which *Euſebius* refers to in *Joſephus* is at the end of his ſeventeenth book of *Antiq.* in theſe words: τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς γενομένης τῇ Σύρων, τιμᾶται Κυρήνιος ἀπὸ Καίσαρος ἀνὴρ ὑπατικὸς ἀποσταλεὶς τά τε ἐν Συρίᾳ, καὶ τὰ Ἀρχελάου ἀποδιωσόμενος ἥξων: *after Archelaus's country was made tributary and added to Syria, Ceſar ſent Quirinus, one who had been Conſul, to enroll* Syria, *and ſell* Archelaus's *own houſe.* See alſo the beginning of the next book.

Verſ. 3. Εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.] This was not only the Cuſtom among the *Jews*, as has been obſerved by *Grotius*, but alſo among the *Romans*, as appears by theſe words in *Livy*, lib. 42. cap. 10. *Cenſa ſunt civium Romanorum capita ducenta ſexaginta novem millia & quindecim. Minor aliquanto numerus, quia L. Poſtumius Conſul pro concione edixerat, qui ſocium Latini nominis ex edicto C. Claudii Conſulis, redire in civitates ſuas debuiſſent, ne quis eorum Romæ, ſed omnes in ſuis civitatibus cenſerentur. There were enrolled of Roman Citizens two hundred ſixty nine thouſand and fifteen; a number ſomewhat leſs than ordinary, becauſe the Conſul* L. Poſthumius *had publickly proclaimed that thoſe of their Confederates who ſhould have returned into their reſpective Cities, purſuant to the Order made by the Conſul* C. Claudius, *ſhould not any of them be enrolled at* Rome, *but in the ſeveral Cities to which they belonged.*

Verſ. 8. Ἀγραυλοῦντες.] From the Shepherds having ſpent the night abroad in the open Field, it cannot be inferred that the Birth of *Chriſt* was not in *December*, as *G. J. Voſſius* has very well ſhewn, in a ſmall Treatiſe *de Nat. Chriſti.* But the *Antients* however not agreeing in their Opinions about the day, nor ſo much as the *year*, in which *Chriſt* was born, one might be ready perhaps to queſtion the Authority of *Juſtin* and *Tertullian*, who tell us that the Tables on which this enrolling here ſpoken of was made, were extant in their time. For from thoſe Records this whole matter might eaſily have been known, and it would have been an inexcuſable neglect in the Chriſtians of that age, who could have looked into thoſe publick Regiſters, and tranſmitted to Poſterity what they had there read, and yet would not do it. But I am afraid that *Tertullian* and others ſpake only by gueſs, becauſe it was not certainly known that thoſe Records were loſt. But this is not a place to treat of this matter.

Verſ. 14. *Note* e.] The *Alexandrian* and *Cambridg* Copies which are both venerable for their antiquity, and the *Latin* and *Gothick* Interpreters have that reading which the *Doctor* here expounds. And therefore it is not true, as *Grotius* ſays, that all the Copies conſent in reading ἰουδαία, tho the greateſt part read it ſo.

Verſ.

Verſ. 35. *Note* f.] It is eaſy to conjecture what was the occaſion of that grief that *like a ſword pierced through the heart* of this holy Woman. For how could ſhe ſee without extreme ſorrow and trouble, almoſt all the *Jews* perſecuting her Son, and that with ſuch implacable fury, as to nail him at laſt to a Croſs? As for the ψυχὴ αὐτῆς, that is either *Mary her ſelf*, according to the genius of the Hebrew, or if you pleaſe her *heart* which might metaphorically be ſaid to be ſtruck through, when ſhe beheld her Son crucified. So in *Statius* Lib. x. *Thebaid.* a Father hearing his Sons life demanded, received the ſentence.

Non ſecus ac torta trajectus cuſpide pectus
——— *exanimis.*

There was no need of interpreting ψυχὴ here to be *the ſenſitive Soul*, to give light to an eaſy phraſe, uſed alſo in other Languages.

Chapter III.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 1. Τετραρχοῦντος] The *Doctor* interprets this in his paraphraſe thus: *Governour of that fourth diviſion of the kingdom called Galilee*; by which words there is no body but would think that *Herod* was here equal'd with *Pilate*, and was a Preſident ſent by *Tiberius*. But the difference between a *Governour* or *Preſident* and a *Tetrarch* he explains in part in his Annotations. He ſhould have added that this *Herodes Antipas* was in poſſeſſion of this Tetrarchſhip in purſuance of *Herod* the Great's will, and did not ſend the revenue of that territory to *Rome* as the Roman Preſidents did, but converted it to his own uſe. He depended indeed upon *Cæſar*, againſt whoſe will he could not have took poſſeſſion of his inheritance, and who could take it away from him when ever he pleaſed, and at laſt did ſo. But he was not however the Emperors tributary, but his friend; and wanted nothing but the title of one to make him a King. And upon this account *Joſephus* Antiq. Jud. *Lib.* 17. *Cap.* 10. calls him Ἐθνάρχης. I make this remark becauſe our Author ſeems in another place, by an intolerable impropriety of ſpeech, to give *Herod* the title of *a Roman Governour*, as if he had not ruled his Principality in his own name but in the *Emperors*. See Note on *Matt.* xxii. 16.

Verſ. 23. Ἀρχόμενος.] The force of this word is not ſufficiently expreſſed by the *Doctor* in his Paraphraſe. St. *Luke*'s words are to be rendred thus: *And Jeſus himſelf when he began* to execute his office, or

Chapter IV. to preach the Gospel, *was about thirty years old, and, as was supposed, was the Son of Joseph*, &c. In the last words, ὢν ὡς ἐνομίζετο is all one with ᾧ ἐνομίζετο, for the Participle ὢν is nothing but a form of passing over to the next words, and they who interpret it otherwise make a difficulty where there is none. Ἦν ὢν ἀρξάμενος cannot be said in Greek for *he began*, which yet is commonly here supposed, tho without producing any such Example. I should paraphrase therefore this Passage thus: "When *Jesus* first began to preach the Gospel, which "he did a little after he had been baptized by *John*, he was about "thirty years old; and was of the Stock of *David*, his Mother being "of the same Family, and *Joseph* her Husband, who was the Son "of, &c.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 8. Ἔπιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς γέγραπται] Besides what has been said by *Grotius* to confirm the truth of this reading, it may be farther observed, that it is read so in *Beza's Cambridg Copy*, and three others which he mentions, besides that which the Authors of the *Coptick* and *Gothick* Versions made use of.

Vers. 9. Ὁ υἱὸς τῦ θεῦ] The Article ὁ is wanting in the *Alexandrian* and *Beza's* antient Copy. It is not expressed in the 3*d Verse*, nor in *Matth.* iv. 6. And therefore *Beza*, who uses to render that Article by a demonstrative Pronoun, has here omitted it, and told us in his Notes that he suspected it. It was possible that the Devil might have known it to have been affirmed by *Mary* and *Joseph*, that *Jesus* was conceived without the assistance of a Man, and by the power of the Holy Ghost; and that for that reason the *Angel* who had foretold his Birth, had said that he should be called the Son of *God*: but it was possible also, that he might question whether that was true or no, and so be willing to tempt our Saviour himself, that he might be more fully satisfied about it. And accordingly the Temptation may be thus expressed; "If thou art the Son of *God*, and "not of a *Man*, as thy Mother says, cast thy self down from hence; "for since thou may'st put thy trust in *God* thy Father, there is no-"thing that thou needest to fear, because it is written in *Psal.* xci. "concerning those that trust in *God*, that he has commanded his "*Angels* to take care of them.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Chapter V.

Verſ. 27. Τελώνιον ὀνόματι Λεϐὶν] St. *Luke* here follows S. *Mark*; but St. *Matthew*, Chap. ix. 9. mentions his own name. It is ſuppoſed by moſt, and by our Author here among the reſt, that *Levi* was but another name for S. *Matthew*; but this is confuted by *Grotius* by divers conſiderable Arguments, in his Notes on *Matt.* ix. which I wonder that Dr. *Hammond* ſhould take no notice of, but follow the common Opinion. St. *Matthew* and *Levi* were perhaps Companions in the ſame *Cuſtom* or *Tollhouſe*, and dwelt together. And *Chriſt* ſeems to have called them *both*, and to have been entertained at a Feaſt by them both at their own houſe. But *Levi* was not choſen to be one of the twelve Apoſtles. And yet why St. *Mark* and *Luke* paſs by *Matthew*, and make mention of *Levi*, I confeſs I can give no reaſon.

CHAP. VI.

Chapter VI.

Verſ. 13. *Note* c. I. THat *Chriſt* was commiſſioned and authorized by *God* to found and govern the Church, and the Apoſtles by *Chriſt*, cannot be matter of doubt with any Chriſtian: but I queſtion whether the importance of the word Ἀπόστολος be ſuch, as that the Authority which belonged to the Apoſtolical Office can by Grammatical Reaſons be thence deduced. *Miſſion* does not, to ſpeak properly, ſignify *Authority*, but only the purpoſe or action of *ſending* by which there is a greater or leſſer Power conferred upon the perſon ſent, according as ſeems good to the perſon that ſends him. Nor can the perſon that is ſo ſent, aſſume to himſelf the Authority of him that ſent him, merely becauſe he *ſent* him, but only becauſe when he was ſent, he received ſuch or ſuch a *Commiſſion*, which he is obliged alſo not to exceed. This our *Author* ſeems indeed to have perceived, tho but obſcurely, whilſt he affirms and denies in the ſame Annotation that the word *Apoſtle* is a Title of Dignity.

II. The *Talmudiſts* term'd them שליחים, or שליחי הצבור *Meſſengers of the Congregation*, that were ſent by the Synagogues on any buſineſs whatſoever, and who among other Offices which they performed, offered up Prayers for thoſe who could not pray for themſelves, in the Synagogue, eſpecially at the beginning of the new year, and on the day of expiation. See *Joan. Buxtorf*, in Lexic. Talmud. and *Camp. Vitringa* de Synagog. *Lib.* 3. Part 2. c. 11. But there were never any Tithes either due, or paid to the *Synagogues*, but only to the *Temple*, as long as it ſtood; to which alſo it was that the ἀπαρχαὶ ſpoken of in

Chapter VII. *Philo*, brought money, and not to the Synagogues. Thus *Philo* p. 785. *Ed. Gen.* ſaith of *Auguſtus*: ἐπίσατο καὶ χρήματα συναγαγόντας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπαρχῶν ἱερὰ καὶ πέμψαντας εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τοὺς θύσοντας ἀναξόμενον: *he knew that they gathered the conſecrated moneys under the name of firſt-fruits, and ſent them to Jeruſalem by thoſe who were going to offer up ſacrifices there.* The like he repeats in p. 801. where he calls thoſe perſons ἱεροπομπούς.

Verſ. 22. *Note* e.] Tho it be true that the word ἄνομα is ſometimes taken for a man, yet the phraſe ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὡς πονηρὸν does not ſignify *to caſt out a man as wicked*, but to *defame*, as *Grotius* has evidently proved, whom the Reader may conſult.

Verſ. 30. *Note* f.] It is true that the perſon here intended is a poor man, who makes uſe of what is anothers; but that the Phraſe ἀπαιτεῖν τὰ ἑαυτῶν ſignifies *to require Uſury*, or ἀπαιτεῖν by it ſelf *to receive upon uſe*, I am not apt to believe, if thoſe words be conſidered conjunctly. For it is not all one as to the finding out the ſignification of words, what connexion or relation they have with one another. I rather chuſe therefore to underſtand this Precept of *Chriſt* thus; That thoſe who can be without what another perſon, who abſolutely needs it, poſſeſſes of theirs, tho it be unjuſtly detained from them, ought rather to recede from their right, than by taking what is their own again, reduce a poor diſtreſſed man to his laſt ſhifts. Indeed if a *rich* man ſhould unjuſtly keep back what is anothers, which he ſtands in no need of, it would not be the part of a liberal Man, but a Fool, to neglect his right; but there cannot be a more generous or liberal Action, than to connive at ſuch a fault in a poor man. And this being a very good ſenſe of this Precept, and agreeable to the uſual ſignification of every word in it, I do not ſee why we ſhould recur to any other.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. OUR Author might have added, that it was ordinary in Scripture to bring in Meſſengers ſpeaking in the ſame words that thoſe would have done who ſent them, if they had been preſent. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, upon the word *Nuntius*.

Verſ. 29. Ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν] *i. e.* They acknowledged *God* to be juſt, and themſelves to be guilty, and that they deſerved the deſtruction which *John* had denounced againſt them. Of the verb δικαιόω ſee our Notes upon *Rom.* iii. 4.

Verſ. 30. Τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ] *i. e.* They rejected *Gods* purpoſe of reforming them by *John*'s Miniſtry. See *Acts* xx. 27.

Verſ. 44. *Note* c. See my Notes on *Gen.* xviii. 4.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. I. IT is true indeed that the meats at Feaſts were divided and diſtributed to the Gueſts by the διάκονοι, or δοῦλοι διακονοῦντες, *miniſtring Servants*; but he is miſtaken, whoever thinks with Dr. *Hammond*, that the Verb διακονεῖν ſignifies this particular action rather than any other ſervice, nor do the places alledged by him prove it. Servants had various employments, which were all called διακονίαι, as among the Latins *miniſteria*. He that divided the Meats, was not called by the general name of διάκονος, but διαιρέτης or χωροφαγῶν in Greek, and in Latin *ſciſſor* or *carptor*. See *Laur. Pignorius*, and *Auſ. Popma* in *Comment.* de *Servis*. The Verb διακονήσῃ in *Luke* xii. 37. does not ſignify only to divide to every one his portion of *meat*, but any *errand* or *employment* that uſed to be given to Servants, whilſt their Maſters were feaſting. The ſame I ſay of *Matth.* xx. 28. and *Mark* x. 45. which the *Doctor* puts a forced ſenſe upon, when they might be moſt fitly explained, according to the conſtant ſignification almoſt of that Verb διακονῶν.

II. Our Learned Author had not ſufficiently examined the paſſage he ſpeaks of in St. *Matthew*; for it is manifeſt that κατακυριεύουσιν there ſignifies to exerciſe Dominion or *Kingly* Authority over *Subjects*, and not that of a *Maſter* over Servants; the Diſcourſe not being about Maſters and Servants, but about Kings and Subjects: *Ye know that the Princes of the Nations*, τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, *exerciſe Dominion over them.* It follows; and *thoſe that are great exerciſe Authority upon them*, κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν, ſuch an Authority as belongs to a Vice-Roy, or the King's Lieutenant. Chriſt here forbids the Governours of his Church to aſſume a Regal Power over Chriſtians, which they do whenſoever they put them to death, or perſecute ſuch as cannot ſay juſt as they ſay: or to take any ſuch Authority upon them, which, on pretence of acting in the name of the Supreme Governor *Jeſus Chriſt*, they might eaſily abuſe to the deſtruction of Chriſtians. In fine, he would have nothing done in an imperious domineering way, but all by perſwaſion and entreaty.

III. The διάκονοι in *John* ii. are thoſe that ſerved the Gueſts in all things which they wanted, as well as in diſtributing to them Meat and Drink. It is not from this latter that the Deacons of the Church were ſo called, as by a Metaphor taken from a Feaſt, but rather from a borrowed ſignification of the word διακονία, which is taken ſometimes for *furniſhing*, i. e. χορηγίαν *ſupplying*, or *delivering out*. And the reaſon

Chapter IX.

ſon of the Metaphor's being taken from hence, ſeems to be becauſe Servants or Miniſters, at their Maſter's command, uſed to bring out whatever was neceſſary, not only for a Feaſt, but all other uſes of Life. But this ſignification of that word ſeems to have obtained only after the purity of the *Greek* Language had bin loſt; for in the anienteſt Writers, it is certain that διακονῶν is never uſed for χορηγῶν, nor διακονία for χορηγία. And in like manner the *Latins* have altered the ſignification of their words *miniſtrare* and *ſubminiſtrare*, which are frequently of late uſed for *ſuppeditare*, *to ſupply*. Perhaps alſo in this place there is a *Latiniſm*, of which kind there are a great many in the New Teſtament. But I leave this to be conſidered by the Learned.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 12. *Note* b. THE Verb καταλύειν ſignifying properly and literally *to looſe*, it is much more likely that it was uſed metaphorically for *baiting* or *lodging* by the way, from the cuſtom of thoſe who uſe to travel in Coaches or Chariots, and whenever they light and betake themſelves to any Inn, have their *Horſes looſed* and carried into a Stable; and becauſe the word κατάλυσις came thence to ſignify the end of any Journey, therefore καταλύειν was uſed in general for *leaving off*, or *putting an end to*, and amongſt other things, *a Sea Voyage*. The Verb καταλύεσθαι is ſo far from being properly ſaid of a Ship's leaving off ſailing, if we conſider the natural and primitive ſignification of that word, that on the contrary they ought then rather to be ſaid ἀναδεῖσθαι, *to be tied faſt* or laid up, and καταλύεσθαι *to be looſed* when they are put to Sea. And therefore alſo the Greeks do not uſe the Verb καλαλύειν ſimply, in the ſignification of *arriving* or coming into Port, but the phraſe καλαλύειν ἐπὶ πλοῖν. It's true, our Author follows *Phavorinus*, who ſays, Καλαλύει τὶς εἰς πανδοχεῖον, ὑπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν καλαγόντων ἀπὸ πλάγος εἰς λιμένα τάττεται. But this obſervation of that, otherwiſe very learned, Grammarian, is contrary both to the uſe and genius of the Greek Language; nor is it always ſafe to rely upon his Authority. And he himſelf alſo confirms in another place what I have ſaid, by a much better remark: Καταλύειν, ſaith he, ὅτε τῷ ξενοδοχεῖσθαι λαμβάνεται. Ἐκ τούτου λέγεται τὸ κατάλυμα, ἐν ᾧ ἀναπαύεταί τις ὑποζύγια ἢ τὰ φορτία λύονται: Καλαλύειν *is taken from lodging in an Inn; and hence comes* κατάλυμα *for an Inn, becauſe therein the Beaſts or their burdens were looſed.* He ſeems to have taken this obſervation from *Euſtathius* on *Odyſſ.* p. 1480. *Ed. Rom.* who ſays there the ſame. And *Suidas* whom the *Doctor* has elſewhere (ſee Not. upon *Mat.* xiv. 3.) commended for his great skill in Grammar,

mar, when there was no occasion for it, plainly favours what I say: Καπ- Chapter
λῶσαι, says he, ἐπὶ Θεωριδῶν ὅτι ἐπὶ ὀχημάτων ὅτι ἅρματος: Καλαλῦσαι *in* Thu- IX.
cidides *is said of those who ride in Chariots*; Καταίγειν δὲ, ὅτι πλοίῳ, & καλάγειν, *of those who travel in Ships, viz.* who are come to the place to which they were bound. Which is said in so many words by the Scholiast upon *Thucydides*, Lib. 1. p. 89. *Ed. F. Porti.* These things being evident, it must be observed by the way, that before ever we can safely make use of the antient Grammarians for finding out the significations of words, the genius and use of the Greek Language must be known some other way, *viz.* by a long and careful reading of the antient Writers, both in Verse and Prose; for otherwise he that hath no more knowledg of the Greek Tongue than what he has attained to by reading the New Testament, and a few of the Fathers, and that not so much with a design to understand the Language, as for the sake of Divinity, and only occasionally consults the old *Lexicons*, will frequently be led into Mistakes. And I wish this could not be said of Dr. *Hammond*, who was otherwise a very excellent Divine, and a man of an extraordinary Judgment.

Vers. 31. *Note* c.] In my last Note I undertook to confute our Author, because I thought he was in a mistake; but in this I shall confirm his Opinion because I think it to be true, and agreeable both to the use of Scripture and the Greek Language. For the word ἔξοδος, where the discourse is concerning a King, signifies his *going forth* to make War with any one, as *Christ* did with the unbelieving *Jews*. So 2 *Sam.* xi. 1. *at the time when Kings go forth*, εἰς ὃν καιρὸν ἐν ἐξόδῳ τῶν βασιλέων, is very well rendered by the *Vulgar*, *Tempore quo solent Reges ad bella procedere*, *at the time when Kings use to go forth to battel.* The same word which is there used יצא, the *Septuagint* translate by ἐκστρατεύω, *Prov.* xxx. 27. So also the Greeks used this word, as *H. Stephanus*, out of *Herodotus*, *Xenophon*, and *Herodian*, shews. Add likewise these Passages to the same purpose out of *Dionysius Halicarnass.* Antiq. Rom. *Lib.* 8. p. 303. πρώτην ἐκστρατείαν ἣν ἐγὼ νέος ὤν, *the first Expedition that I served in was when I was very young.* Lib. 11. p. 734. τὴν ἔξοδον μὴ κωλύειν τῶν καταγεγραμμένων, *not to hinder the going out of the Souldiers to battel.* In the same sense he useth ἔξοδον ποιήσασθαι for *to make an Expedition*, Lib. 8. p. 531. So the *old Glosses*, Ἔξοδος εἰς πόλεμον, *an expedition.* Ἔξοδος ἐνδημικὴ στρατιωτῶν, *a military Expedition*, or *the going out of Souldiers to war.*

And it cannot seem strange that the Vengeance that *Christ* was about to take upon his Enemies the *Jews*, should be represented by his *going out to battel* against them; for also in the Old Testament the punishments

Chapter X.

niſhments which *God* threatned to inflict upon wicked men, are often repreſented in the ſame manner. So *Iſa.* xlii. 13. where there is the ſame Phraſe made uſe of as here, it is ſaid, *The Lord ſhall go forth as a mighty Man, he ſhall ſtir up jealouſy like a Souldier; he ſhall cry and roar, he ſhall prevail againſt his Enemies.* Which might be rendered into Greek very well thus; ὁ Γενεσιαρχὴς ἔξεισι ὡσπερ ἀνδρεῖος· ἀνὴρ ἔξοδον ποιήσει, &c. See alſo *Chap.* xiii. of the ſame Prophet, where *God* is repreſented as leading an Army of the *Medes* againſt *Babylon.*

Ibid. Ὃν ἤμελλε πληγὴν] The *Evangeliſt* might have expreſſed it by ὃν ἤμελλε ποιεῖν; but the reaſon of his uſing the word πληγὴν was, becauſe this Expedition of *Chriſt* againſt the *Jews* was foretold by *Malachi* in *Chap.* iv. 1.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 12. Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται.] Altho the *Sodomites* had been puniſhed long ago, and ſtill ſuffer by a fearful expectation of further Vengeance from *God*, yet it ſeems by this place that they will not have their utmoſt puniſhment inflicted upon them till the univerſal Judgment. And the ſame we are to think of all the reſt of the wicked; ſee *verſ.* 14. of this *Chapter.* And upon this account it is, that the puniſhments of bad men are frequently referred to that day, not only in the Scripture, but alſo in the Books of the Antient Fathers. Read to this purpoſe the excellent Diſcourſe of *Lud. Capellus* about the State of the Soul after Death.

Verſ. 18. Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς τὸν ἀστραπὴν πεσόντα] *i. e.* I was thinking and repreſenting to my ſelf before-hand, the deſtruction that is ſuddenly to befal the Devil's Kingdom. The overthrow of the Devil's Kingdom is deſcribed by his *falling from Heaven*; becauſe as *being lifted up to Heaven*, ſignifies the greateſt Glory, as we may ſee here by the 15th *Verſe*, where it is ſaid, *And thou* Capernaum *which haſt been exalted to Heaven*, &c. ſo the *falling from Heaven*, or *being thruſt down to Hell*, ſignifies the loſing of that former Glory. So, *Iſa.* xiv. 12. the King of *Babylon* being dethroned and dead, the other deceaſed Kings of the Nations are repreſented as meeting him, and ſaying amongſt other things; *How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning?* i. e. How cameſt thou to be dethroned and killed? So the *Latins* alſo uſed to expreſs themſelves. Thus *Cicero* ſaith of *Antonius*, who had deprived his Collegue of all his Authority, *Phil.* 2. *Collegam quidem de cœlo detraxiſti.* And, *Lib.* 1. *ad Atticum*, Ep. 20. ſpeaking of *Pompey*

Pompey he ſaith; *Quia deciderat ex aſtris, lapſus potius quam progreſſus videbatur.* Chapter XI.

CHAP. XI.

Verſ. 7. Παιδία.] Tho this word *paidia* doth for the moſt part ſignify *Children*; yet I ſhould chuſe here to interpret it *Servants*, ſo as to make it anſwerable to the Hebrew נער which ſignifies both *Child* and *Servant*, and is rendered παῖς by the *Septuagint* in 1 *Sam.* xxi. 5. where the Diſcourſe is not about Children, but about Servants: Παῖς & παιδάριον often ſignify the ſame.

Verſ. 42. Πᾶν λάχανον.] If this be interpreted according to the Doctrin of the *Talmud*, the Adjective δεκάτιον muſt be underſtood; for the *Jews* paid Tithes of ſuch Herbs only as were eaten, and not of all ſorts: ſee *Selden* of *Tithes*, Chap. 2. S. 7.

Verſ. 47. *Note* e. I am apt to think that it is the very adorning of the Sepulchres it ſelf, with which the *Jews* are here upbraided, tho they did it with a contrary deſign, as if this had been a ſymbolical expreſſion of their cruelty. See *Grotius* upon *Mat.* xxiii. 29. what our *Author* ſays here is forced.

CHAP. XII.

Verſ. 13. Διδάσκαλε, &c.] The *Doctor* follows *Grotius* in his Paraphraſe upon this Verſe; but if we carefully conſider the words we ſhall find, that the Man who here makes his complaint to *Chriſt*, does not deſire him to perform the Office of a *Judg* or *Arbitrator* between him and his Brother, but to make uſe of his *propbetical* Authority to oblige his Brother who detained the *whole* Inheritance, to *divide* it with him. But *Chriſt* tells them that ſuch civil Matters did not belong to his Office. Tho he might have occaſionally concerned himſelf in them, yet he declined it; not that he feared the ingratitude or ill-will of the contending Parties, if they were not both ſatisfied; but as I rather think, leſt he ſhould be ſaid by the *Phariſees*, to leſſen the Magiſtrates Authority, and be ambitious of Government: See *Note* on *Mat.* viii. 4. Chapter XII.

Verſ. 19. Ψυχὴ ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ.] *Seneca* Ep. c. 1. hath a very elegant Paſſage to this purpoſe, concerning ſuch another man as *Chriſt* here ſpeaks of: *In ipſo actu*, ſays he, *bene currentium rerum, in ipſo procurrentis pecuniæ impetu, raptus eſt. He was ſnatched away in the full career of his Fortune.*

Insere nunc, Melibæe, pyros, pone ordine vites.

Quam stultum est ætatem disponere? ne crastino quidem dominamur. O quanta dementia est spes longas inchoantium! Emam, ædificabo, credam, exigam, honores geram, tum demum lassam & plenam senectutem in otium referam. Omnia mihi crede, etiam felicibus dubia sunt. How foolish a thing is it for a man to dispose of his life, when even so much as to morrow is not in our power? O how great is the madness of those who propose to themselves designs that must be a long while in compassing! who say within themselves, I will buy, I will build, I will trust out, I will gather in again, I will go through such and such Honours and Dignities, and then at length spend a full and tired old Age in rest and ease. Alas, the most fortunate are sure of possessing nothing long.

CHAP. XIII.

Vers. 23. *Note* b. I. THE Verb σώζω properly signifies to *preserve safe*, and comes from Σῶς *safe*. It uses for the most part to be applied to *bodies*, and such things as relate to the *Body*. The Hebrew Verb ישע has the same signification, as appears by abundance of places. So *Psal.* xxxvi. 6. *Thou preservest man and beast*, תושיע is rendered by the *Septuag.* ἀνθρώπους καὶ κτήνη σώσεις. So the word Σωτὴρ is taken by St. *Paul* in 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. where, speaking of *God*, he says, *He is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe.* Our Author produces a great many more Examples.

II. Afterwards this word was applied to the safety of the Mind; in which sense also we find it used by the Heathen Writers, out of whom I shall set down some Instances which will confirm what Dr. *Hammond* says. Thus *Cebes* in his *Tab.* p. 11. *Ed. Amst. Gronov.* speaking of the Genius which he supposed every one had to direct and instruct him, saith; δεικνύει πῇαν ὁδὸν αὐτὸς δεῖ βαδίζειν, εἰ ΣΩΖΕΣΘΑΙ μέλλουσιν ἐν βίῳ: *it shews what way they are to take if they would be SAVED in life, i. e.* if they would be preserved from those Calamities and Evils with which Vice is usually attended. And, *pag.* 13. speaking of the Passions that were drawn in the shapes of Women, and which are the causes either of Mens safety or destruction, he saith; τῶν δ' ἀπάγουσι αὐτούς; *but whither do they lead them?* Αἱ μὲν εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι, ἔφη, αἱ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἀπόλλυσθαι: *Some lead them to safety, and others to ruin.* And, *pag.* 25. speaking of one that embraced the opinion which led to true Learning, he saith; καθαρθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτῆς σώζεται, καὶ μακάριος καὶ εὐδαίμων γίγνεται ἐν παντὶ

πατὴ τῇ βίῳ: *being purged thereby, he is ſaved and made bleſſed and happy all his life*; that is, he is preſerved from vice, and the miſeries that accompany it. And, *pag.* 43. he that is repreſented as the explainer of the Table, ſays to his inquiſitive Hearers, after they had promiſed to live according to what they had heard; Τοιαῦτα σωθήσεσθε, *If you do ſo you ſhall be ſaved.* So *Plutarch* in his Book *of the difference between a Friend and a Flatterer*, towards the end; Διογένης ἔλεγεν ὅτι τὸν μέλλοντα σώζεσθαι δεῖ φίλους ἀγαθοὺς ἢ δεινοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπάρχειν: *Diogenes ſaid, That he that would be ſaved, muſt either have good Friends, or furious Enemies.* For *Diogenes*, who was a deſpiſer of Riches, and all thoſe things that related to the Body, conſidered nothing but the ſafety of the Mind. I have met with ſeveral other Examples to the ſame purpoſe, which I cannot at preſent remember, but theſe are more than enough.

Chapter XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

Verſ. 23. Ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν.] See *Grotius* upon this place, and how he corrects St. *Auſtin* for his moſt ſhameful abuſe of it, for it deſerves to be called no better. And yet there are ſome that reſolve ſtill to follow St. *Auſtin*, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, the nature of the Chriſtian Religion, and common Senſe it ſelf. Nay, there is a late Enthuſiaſtical upſtart, a contemptible Woman's follower, that has fooliſhly attempted to skim over and defend St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion, tho he either never read him, or never underſtood him; and he every where falls foul upon the Criticks for not interpreting the words of Scripture according to the wild fancies of crackbrain'd Women, but according to the nature of things themſelves, and the conſtant uſe of Languages. But this Paſſage alone is enough to ſhew us of what advantage Grammar, or if you pleaſe *Criticiſm*, is to the right interpretation of Scripture, ſeeing St. *Auſtin*, who was otherwiſe a very ingenious man, but an abſolute ſtranger to this ſort of Learning, did ſo wretchedly force and miſinterpret this Paſſage, and make uſe of it to defend the moſt cruel Opinion imaginable. Add to what *Grotius* has ſaid upon this place, my Notes upon *Gen.* xix. 13. If there were any ſort of force here intended, it muſt be that which God makes uſe of by his ſevere and afflictive Providences, which do often *conſtrain*, as it were, wicked men to live better than they did before, tho gentler methods had been ineffectual to reform them. There is an elegant Paſſage, and a true one (if we do but change the word *Gods* into *God*) to this purpoſe, in *Æſchylus* in *Agamemn.* not far from the beginning:

Chapter XV.

Καὶ παρ' ΑΚΟΝΤΑΣ ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν,
Δαιμόνιον δ' ἦν τι χάρις, βιαίως
Σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.

Even the unwilling have grown wiſe by force, through a particular favour of the Gods, who ſit in a venerable Seat. But whatever *God* does, doubtleſs *men* ought not to force their fellow Creatures to be of their Perſwaſion.

Verſ. 34. Τὸ ἅλας, &c.] Becauſe Proverbs, and proverbial forms of Speech are commonly grounded upon what is really done, when the matter of them is ſomething poſſible. I have been ready ſometimes to imagin, that the τὸ ἅλας here is not to be underſtood of *Salt* properly ſpeaking, becauſe that which is here ſaid of Salt, neither does nor ever can happen to it. For, *Firſt*, *Salt* is never infatuated, μωραίνεται. *Secondly*, Salt which keeps its ſavour, *is not fit either for the Land, or for the Dungbil. Thirdly*, When it is infatuated, *it is not* CAST OUT. What if we ſhould ſuppoſe therefore that Wood-aſhes was by the Husbandmen called Salt? They, it's certain, are, 1. *infatuated*, if they are *waſhed* or ſoak'd in Water, as it happens when they are made uſe of for the cleanſing of foul Linen. And, 2. after they have been thus *ſoaked* in water, they are unfit to be uſed as a means to *enrich* the ground, either alone or mixed with dung, becauſe it was only the *Salt* that was in them before their being ſo ſoaked, which made them proper for *that purpoſe*. And if they be ſpread upon the Land before the Salt is waſhed out, they ſerve very much to make it fruitful, either by themſelves, or elſe mixed with dung. And, 3. when they are infatuated, that is, when all the Salt Particles are waſhed out of them, they uſed rather to be caſt out into the *way* or *ſtreet*, than upon a *dunghil* or the *fields*. But I confeſs I can produce no Example to ſhew that theſe Wood-aſhes were called Salt, and therefore I affirm nothing peremptorily. But let the Learned conſider what there may be in this Conjecture.

CHAP. XV.

Verſ. 16. *Note* b. OF this Fruit *Salmaſius* hath treated at large in his *Exercit. Plin. in Solin.* p. 326. & ſeqq. *Ed. Ultraj.* who may be conſulted by thoſe that are curious about ſuch matters. However it is no where ſaid by *Pliny* that this Fruit was ordinary among the *Egyptians*; nay, on the contrary, he denies,

as

as *Theophraſtus* had done before him, that it grew in *Egypt*, Lib. 13. c. 8. but affirms that it was common in *Syria*; ſo that in this alſo our Author is miſtaken. Conſult *Salmaſius*. Chapter XV.

Verſ. 22. Ἐξενέγκατε τὴν στολὴν —— δάκτυλιον.] *H. Grotius* thinks, that as we ought not to be ſuperſtitious in ſearching for Allegories in every part of a Parable; ſo neither ought we to overlook them when they are ſuggeſted by the agreement of what is ſaid in Parables, with other places of Scripture. And therefore if we believe him, the στολὴ, or *Robe*, here ſignifies that conſtant innocency of Life, which by God's Grace, a Perſon who has receiv'd ſo much mercy from him, is enabled to perſevere in. And for this he refers us to *Rev.* vi. 11. & vii 13, 14. & xix. 8. Now I do not indeed deny, but that a white Robe is taken ſometimes for an Emblem of Innocence; but I ſay that there is nothing ſaid of that here; and that the beſtowing of the precious Robe, ſignifies the Father's Joy for the return of his Son: ſo that we are not to conſider the Robe in it ſelf, but only the Father's Affection in giving it. He tells us alſo, as the Antients have done before him, that by the *Ring* we are to underſtand the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, *by which we are ſealed*, as the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeaks 2 *Cor.* i. 21. But this part of the Parable likewiſe is only a farther deſcription of the Father's Joy for the ſafe return of his prodigal Son, whom he thought to have been loſt, and mourned upon that account. And to repreſent this Joy to us, *Chriſt* makes uſe of Similitudes taken from the received cuſtom; for at that time a Superior could not confer a greater Honour upon his Inferior, than by beſtowing a *Ring* and a *Robe* upon him. Of which we have an Example in *Gen.* xli. 42. See my Notes on the place. The beſt way therefore had been to look only to the main ſcope of the Parable, which is ſufficiently plain, and not to inſiſt upon the ſignificancy of every particular word: For whatſoever may be ſaid of that kind, tho not altogether frivolous, is certainly beſides *Chriſt*'s deſign; and has no other foundation than the ingenious fancy of the Interpreter. But that learned Expoſitor had put almoſt all the principal Obſervations which he had to make upon the three firſt Goſpels, in his Notes upon St. *Matthew*, and therefore he could not be large upon the two following; and ſometimes, that he might not be wholly ſilent, he was forced to ſay a great many far-fetch'd things, and now and then intermix Allegories in his Annotations. Tho I would not have this taken as an Argument that I have the leaſt undervaluing thought of that incomparable Man.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Verſ. 9. *Note* b. IT is moſt true, that there are a great many Verbs uſed in the Scripture without any *Nominative caſe* to them; and that therefore we muſt ſupply that defect in our own thoughts, unleſs they be impersonal Verbs. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xi. 9. and my *Index* to the *Pentat.* on the word *Perſona.* But this Obſervation can have no place in 1 *Sam.* xxi. 8. becauſe it holds only when the Verb is in the third perſon *maſculine*, and in that place it is in the *feminine.*

Verſ. 12. *Note* c. This interpretation of ἀλλότριον is, with the learned Doctor's leave, a mere nicety. The word ἀλλότριον is taken here in a Philoſophical ſenſe, for that which does not belong to the Mind, and is ſuch as may be taken away from us againſt our will, as *Riches.* And on the other hand, that which *Chriſt* calls ὑμέτερον, is that which pertained to the minds of thoſe whom he ſpake to, and could not be taken away from them againſt their wills, *viz.* the Truths of the Goſpel. The meaning of *Chriſt* in this place is, that thoſe who abuſed their Riches, and could not obtain of themſelves to employ them to better purpoſes, were unfit to receive the true Goſpel-riches as they ought, and would not uſe them better than they did the other. Nothing is more common among the *Philoſophers*, and eſpecially the *Stoicks*, than this diſtinction of ἀλλότρια & ἡμέτερα. *Pricæus* upon this place has given us ſome Examples of it; and a great many more might be added out of *Epictetus* only. Thus, *Enchirid.* Cap. 1. telling us what things are not in our power, he inſtances in the Body, Riches, Honours, Empires, and in a word, ſaith he, ὅσα μὴ ἡμέτερα ἔργα, *every thing but our own Works.* And, *Cap.* 2. he ſays, that thoſe things which have their dependence on us, cannot by any one be hindered; but thoſe which are not in our power, are weak, obnoxious to ſervitude, and a great many impediments; in fine, they are ἀλλότρια. And, *Cap.* 3. he hath theſe words; Μίμνησο οὖν ὅτι ἐὰν τὰ φύσει δοῦλα ἐλεύθερα οἰηθῇς, καὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἴδια ἐκπηδήσῃ——————ἐὰν δὲ τὸ σὸν μόνον οἰηθῇς σὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἀλλότριον, ὥσπερ ἐστίν, ἀλλότριον, οὐδείς σε ἀναγκάσει, &c. *Remember therefore, that if thou thinkeſt thoſe things which are ſervile to be free, and thoſe things which are* ἀλλότρια, *anothers, to be thy own, thou wilt be hindered,——but if thou counteſt that only to be thy own which is thy own, and that which is anothers to be as it is anothers, then no body will compel thee,* &c. See likewiſe his *larger Diſcourſes*, Lib. 3. c. 24. I have alſo taken notice of a word borrowed from the *Stoicks*, in a Note on *Mat.* xix. 28.

Verſ.

Verſ. 19. *Note* d. This Tranſlation which the *Doctor* gives us of the Parable ſet down in *Gemara Babyl.* is partly according to the words in the Hebrew, and partly according to the Latin Verſion of *R. Sheringamus*, and taken from thence; and this has led our exact Author into a miſtake which ought indeed eaſily to be forgiven him: but whereby it appears that Learned Men are overſeen ſometimes when they ſeem to be moſt exact. That part of the Parable which there is a miſtake in the *Doctor's* Tranſlation, is word for word according to the Talmudical Dialect thus; *A King of Fleſh and Blood made a great Feaſt, and called to it* all the Children of his City. *There came a certain poor Man and ſtood at the Gate*, &c. *Sheringamus* in *Præf. ad Cod. Joma*, ſets down this Parable in Hebrew and Latin, and with more freedom than ordinary tranſlates the words כל בני עירו, which ought to have been rendred *omnes filios urbis ſuæ*, by *multos hoſpites.* And Dr. *Hammond* knowing that the word *hoſpes* is ſometimes uſed in the ſame Notion with *exterus* or *peregrinus*; and not ſufficiently conſidering that the Diſcourſe here was about *Gueſts*, tranſlates that by *Strangers*, whereas it is very manifeſt that the words בני עירו ſignify *Citizens*, i. e. Perſons belonging to the ſame City. And this I have thought fit here to take notice of, not out of a captious humor, but only to warn the Reader that he ought not to be too ſevere a Judg of thoſe miſtakes which the Learned ſometimes fall into through want of care, ſince we err ſometimes when we are moſt careful. But I have this farther to add, that I cannot ſee any reaſon why this Parable ſhould be thought to be the ſame with that here in St. *Luke*, when all the likeneſs that there is between them is only, that the ſubject of them both is a rich Man and a Beggar. But their ſcope is quite different.

Chapter XVI.

Verſ. 22. Ἀπενεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων.] *Plato* in *Phædone*, S. 41. (however he came by the Notion) has a Paſſage much to this purpoſe, for he ſuppoſes the Souls of good men to have their ξυνεμπόρους καὶ ἡγεμόνας θεούς, *Gods who accompany and conduct them*, εἰς τόπον ἐκάστοις προσήκοντα, *into their proper place.*

Ibid. Τέκνον.] Οὐκ εἶπεν, ſays *Titus Boſtrenſis*, Pag. 808. C. ἀπάνθρωπε καὶ ὠμὲ, &c. ἀλλά τι; τέκνον, φησί: *he did not ſay cruel and inhuman wretch*, &c. *but what? my Son, ſaith he.*

CHAP.

Chapter XVII.

CHAP. XVII.

Verſ. 7. Δοῦλον.] This word the *Doctor* in his Paraphraſe interprets an *hired Servant*; but the proper Greek word for that is Μίσθιος, not Δοῦλος, which is the name of a *Slave*. I know the word Δοῦλος is uſed in the New Teſtament in both theſe ſenſes; but there is no mention made here of any *hire* or *reward* due for ſervice, and I do not ſee any reaſon why we ſhould depart from the moſt uſual ſignification of the word.

Verſ. 9. Μὴ χάριν ἔχει] A Maſter whoſe Authority over his Servant is abſolute, is not obliged, χάριν ἔχειν, to *thank* that Servant who does nothing but what he is commanded; for the condition of a Slave is ſuch, that he is *bound* to do whatſoever he is ordered, and is able to do. But on the other hand, a *Hireling* is not obliged to perform any ſervile Offices againſt his will. Having agreed with his Maſter for ſuch a reward for ſuch or ſuch work, he cannot be compelled againſt his will to any other employments; and if he voluntarily undertake them, he ought to be thanked for it. It was the general Notion of Maſters, that *giving attendance was the peculiar office of a Slave, whoſe condition was ſuch, that nothing which he did was looked upon as an obligation by his Maſter.* They are the words of *Seneca*, Lib. 3. c. 18. *de Benefic.* who nevertheleſs, contrary to the vulgar opinion, affirms, that a Maſter may receive a benefit from his Slave. But *Chriſt* here ſpeaks of Maſters that uſe the utmoſt rigour and according to the received Notion and Cuſtom. I ſhall only add that our Author has admirably connected this Parable with what goes before in his Paraphraſe.

CHAP. XVIII.

Chapter XVIII.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. THO the Verbs κολαφίζειν & ὑπωπιάζειν come from the ſame Primitive, yet they cannot therefore be compared with one another; for we ought not to conſider the ſignifications of their Primitives, but the words from which they are moſt immediatly derived. Ὑπώπιον is that part of the face or countenance which lies juſt under the eye, and is taken alſo for a blue Scar cauſed by a bruiſe given to that part. And becauſe the *pugils* or *cuffers* uſed often to ſtrike thoſe parts with their Fiſts, the Verb ὑπωπιάζειν properly ſignified *fugillare, to give one a black and blue Eye*, as it is rendered in the *Old Gloſſes*. Afterwards the Noun ὑπώπιον was metaphorically uſed to ſignify *diſgrace* or *infamy*, as by *Cicero* and *Nilus*. And

And in the ſame ſenſe alſo the Latins often uſed the words *nota* and *plaga*: And from this ſignification of the Noun στίγμα, it is that the Verb στιγματίζω came to ſignify, as in this place, to *defame*; juſt as among the *Latins* likewiſe the Verb *ſugillare*, which is properly to give one a blow upon the Eye, ſignifies alſo the ſame with *infamare*. And in this ſenſe undoubtedly it is that the Greek is rendered in the *vulgar* by *ſugillare*, and that rightly. The unjuſt Judg was afraid leſt the Woman ſhould defame him, and ruin his reputation every where where ſhe went, by her cries and complaints. Chapter XIX.

The proper ſignification of the Verb ἐντρέπειν, according to its etymology, is indeed that which our *Author* ſays; but where the diſcourſe is of God, it ſignifies only *to beg ſo as to obtain*; and we ought not to inſiſt upon the original of the word: for *to put God to ſhame* is a phraſe that muſt needs ſeem intolerable to all, but ſuch as are not aſhamed when they ſpeak never ſo clowniſhly or improperly; of which number certainly was the *Doctor*, whoſe want of expreſſion was equal to his learning. The *Heathens* perhaps would not ſcruple ſaying, that *they put their Gods to ſhame*; but I ſhould hardly forgive a *Chriſtian* that would ſpeak in that manner of *God*.

CHAP. XIX.

Verſ. 9. Τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.] *It is a Synecdoche*, ſaith *Grotius*; *for the houſe is put for the maſter of the houſe*. But I rather think that it is put, as it moſt uſually ſignifies, for the *Family*, which by the Maſter's example might be reduced to a better life; or for his *Wife and Children*, who perhaps imitated the one her Husband, and the other their Father.

Verſ. 12. Ἄνθρωπός τις ἐπορεύθη, &c.] Tho the meaning of *Chriſt* in this Parable be ſufficiently plain, and rightly enough explained by the *Doctor*; yet he did not ſee the reaſon of its being ſo conceived or worded by *Chriſt*, neither ought *Chriſt* to be underſtood to ſpeak of an independent King, or one that went to take poſſeſſion of a Kingdom which he had a *natural* right to. But he took this Parable from the cuſtom of the Kings of his time, who reigned rather by the courteſy of the Roman Emperors, than by any privilege of birth: Such as all thoſe were, who were in *Judæa* from the time of *Herod* the Great. They could not take the Scepter in their hands, without the permiſſion of thoſe who had the ſupreme Government at *Rome*. *Herod* the *Great* took a long Journey, that he might obtain the Kingdom of *Judæa* from *Antonius*, and he did not go in vain; for as *Joſephus* tells us,

Chapter XIX.

Antiq. Jud. Lib. 14. c. 25 & 26. he went out of *Judæa* to *Rome*, and thence, τὴν βασιλείαν μεγαλαῶν, *having received the Kingdom*, he returned into *Judæa*. And afterwards he took another Journey, that he might have his Kingdom confirmed to him by *Cæsar*, as we are told by the same *Historian*, Lib. 15. cap. 10. And his Successors were forced to do the same, as that Author likewise informs us, *Lib.* 17. *cap.* 13. Against these the *Jews* sometimes sent Embassies to *Rome*, either to hinder the Kingdoms being conferred upon them, or else that they might procure their being deposed. So they accused *Archelaus* to *Cæsar* by their Embassadors at that Court; see *Cap.* 11, & 15. *of that Book.* And this shews us the reason why this Parable here is so conceived, which it is impossible to learn by our Author's Paraphrase. *Archelaus*, for example, *was* ἀνθρωπος ευγενὴς, *a Man of noble birth*, for he was the Son of *Herod*. And this Nobleman *went into a far Country* (viz. *Italy*) *to receive for himself the Kingdom* (of *Judæa*) *and to return* (into *Judæa.*) *But his Citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying* (to *Cæsar*) *we will not have this man to reign over us*; which nevertheless they could not obtain. And so *he returned, having received the Kingdom*, or ἐθνάρχειαν μεγαλαῶν, as *Josephus* speaks: And severely punished *those Enemies* of his *who would not that he should reign over them.* What is said here by Interpreters about the Grammatical sense of this Parable, (give me leave to say it) is very obscure in comparison of this.

Vers. 20. Ἐν Σουδαρίῳ.] *Grotius* who is followed therein by a great many others, thought that the word σουδάριον here signified any sort of Linen cloth. But I believe it is to be understood properly of that particular piece of Linen which serves to wipe the sweat off the Face, and which used in Latin to be called *Orarium*, *a Handkerchief*; as has been proved at large by *Is. Casaubon*, and *Cl. Salmasius* upon *Aurelian.* And this, as it is now, being constantly wore, served People for want of a Purse to tie and wrap up their money in, which is also sometimes still practised.

Vers. 21. Αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας.] Instead of this St. *Matthew* hath συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας, *gathering where thou hast not scattered*, which is to the same sense. But St. *Luke* seems to have expressed this proverbial form of speech most exactly, which had its rise from a Law common to the Jews, with many other Nations: *Quæ non posuisti, ne tollito*; *What thou hast not laid down, do not take up*: Of which Law see my Notes on *Levit.* vi. 3. This was a kind of theft: but because those that found any thing after it was lost, could not be prosecuted at Law, as being for the most part alone when they found it, and telling

no

no body of their good Fortune; ſuch as reſtored what they had ſo found to the right owner, were looked upon as fair and juſt men, who acted from religious Principles, and not the fear of human Laws. And on the other hand, a covetous or greedy perſon generally kept whatever he found, becauſe he could not be forced by the Law to reſtore it. And therefore ſuch a man as lays hold of every opportunity which offers it ſelf for his own intereſt, without having any regard to equity, is called by St. *Matthew* σκληρὸς, and by St. *Luke* αὐστηρὸς, *a hard, cloſe-fiſted, tenacious, rough man*, as *Pricæus* upon *Mat.* xxv. 44. has well obſerved. Αυστηρὸς is an ambiguous word, and ſignifies both a *grave* and ſevere man, and one that is *ruſtick* and ſavage. *Suidas*: αὐστηροὺς εἶναι πάντας τοὺς σεμνοὺς καὶ σπουδαίους, τῷ μήτε αὐτοὺς καθ' ἡδονὴν ὁμιλεῖν, μήτε παρ' ἄλλοις τὰ καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀποδέχεσθαι. Καὶ ἄλλον δέ εἶναι αὐστηρὸν, ὥσπερ οἶνον λεγόμενον τῷ αὐστηρῷ οἴνῳ ᾧ καὶ μὲ φαρμακοποσίας χρῶνται, πρὸς δὲ τερπνὸν ἢ πότον, ὅτι ὁ αὐστηρὸν ἢ Κωμῳδία ἀγροικον ἡγεῖται: *They call all* wiſe *and* grave *men* auſtere, *becauſe they neither converſe themſelves for pleaſure, nor admit any pleaſant diſcourſe from others; and there is* another ſort of men *called* auſtere, *juſt as* Wine *is ſaid to be* auſtere, *which is uſed in* medicinal Potions, *but* never drank; *becauſe in Comedy* a ruſtick *man is called* auſtere. In the ſignification of *fierceneſs* or *ſavageneſs*, it is uſed by *Diodorus Siculus*, Lib. 3. p. 168. where, ſpeaking of a ſort of beaſt that has a head like a dog, he ſaith; ἀγριώταλα δὲ παῦτα τὰ ζῶα, καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαράσκευα. Τὴν ἀπὸ τῶ ὀφρύων σκληρότητα αὐστηρότερον ἔχει· *They are exceeding fierce Creatures, and impoſſible to be tanned by any means whatſoever. They have a fiercer aſpect under the Eyebrows than ordinary.* I need not tell the Reader, that this word is taken here in the worſt ſenſe.

Chapter XX.

CHAP. XX.

Verſ. 16. Ἐλάσιται, &c.] This is the anſwer of the *Sanhedrim*, tho their name for brevity ſake be here omitted; as appears from *Mat.* xxi. 41. See on *verſ.* 24.

Ibid. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπον· μὴ γένοιτο.] This muſt be rendered thus; *And when they had underſtood* (*viz.* that theſe things were ſpoken againſt them) *they ſaid* (within themſelves) *God forbid*; for they did not apply the Parable to themſelves aloud: See *Mat.* xxi. 45. and afterwards *ver.* 19. of this *Chapter*. Thus the omiſſion of a Circumſtance often ſeems to alter a Hiſtory; ſo that thoſe who tell it large, ſeem to contradict thoſe who relate it more briefly, when yet really they agree with one another.

Chapter XX.

Verſ. 20. Παρατηρήσαντες.] It is well obſerved by learned Men, that this Verb παρατηρεῖν ſignifies to wait for an opportunity of doing miſchief: See *Chap.* xiv. 1. of this *Goſpel*, and my Notes upon *Gen.* iii. 15.

Verſ. 24. Τίνα ἔχει εἰκόνα.] St. *Luke* omits here what St. *Matthew* expreſſes, and muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, *viz. And they brought unto him a Penny, and he ſaid unto them*, Mat. xxii. 19. Such another omiſſion I have already taken notice of on *verſ.* 16.

Verſ. 27. Ἀνάστασιν.] Our learned Author interprets this word in his Paraphaſe, *a future ſtate after this life:* And indeed the Sadducees did deny, not only the reſurrection of the Body, but alſo the immortality of the Soul. But ἀνάστασις never ſignifies ſimply a future State, and the Argument of the Sadducees oppoſes nothing but the Reſurrection. I have elſewhere confuted the *Doctor*'s opinion about this word; ſee Note on *Mat.* xxii. 31.

Verſ. 46. Ἐν Στολαῖς.] It is very well known that the Greek word στολὴ is uſed as well for a *man*'s as a woman's Garment, tho the Latin *ſtola* ſignifies only a *woman*'s. This is more than once proved by *Oct. Ferrarius* Lib. *de Re Veſtiaria.* And yet *Epiphanius* ſeems to have underſtood the word στολὴ here of a woman's Garment, who *Hæreſ.* 16. ſays, that the Phariſees were like the Scribes, διὰ τὴν ἀμπεχόνης——— καὶ γυναικῶν ἱματίων, *for their apparel and womaniſh Garments.* But perhaps he ſpeaks in that manner, becauſe amongſt the Greeks the men wore ſhort Garments, or χιτῶνες *Coats*, and the women long Gowns, ſuch as were uſual among ſeveral of the Eaſtern Nations. In antient times alſo *ſtola talaris*, *a gown reaching down to the Ancles*, ſeems to have been a Garment worn by Women among the *Aſſyrians*; See *Oct. Ferrarius* in *Analectis*, cap. 23. But it is a good obſervation that Pope *Celeſtine* the firſt makes concerning Clergymen, in his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of the Provinces of *Vienne* and *Narbonne*; *Diſcernendi*, inquit, *à plebe vel cæteris ſumus doctrinâ, non veſte; converſatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu. We ought*, ſaith he, *to diſtinguiſh our ſelves from the common people, or the reſt of mankind, by our Doctrin, not by our Apparel; by our Converſation, not by our Habit; by the purity of our Minds, not by our Dreſs.*

CHAP.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. THO βάλλειν εἰς γαζοφυλάκιον & βάλλειν εἰς δῶρα, be all one as to the ſenſe, yet it is falſe that δῶρα & γαζοφυλάκιον are the ſame; for the latter phraſe properly ſignifies *to caſt in among the Gifts* or *Offerings*, and the former only *into a Cheſt*, of which there were ſeveral in the Temple wherein the Money was depoſited, that was voluntarily conſecrated to the uſe of the Temple. See *Lightfoot's Deſcript.* of the *Temple*, Chap. 19.

Verſ. 6. Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε.] There are ſome that add here a note of *interrogation*, as if *Chriſt* had ſaid, *Are theſe the things which ye look upon?* as it is in the *Cambridg* Copy, wherein the Goſpels are rather paraphraſed, than the words only variouſly read: and therefore *Grotius* juſtly rejects this note of Interrogation. The *Evangeliſt* expreſſes himſelf here juſt as the beſt Writers ſometimes do. The end of the ſentence does not anſwer the beginning, but the whole is made up of two different forms of ſpeech mixed together: For either he ſhould have ſaid Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε πανταχῶς καθαιρεθήσονται, ἐλεύσονται γὰρ ἡμέραι, &c. *Theſe things which ye behold ſhall be quite deſtroyed, for the days will come*, &c. or τότων ἃ θεωρεῖτε ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος, &c. Of *theſe things which ye behold, the days will come in which there ſhall not be left one ſtone upon another.* But the *Evangeliſt* begins juſt as if he was about to expreſs himſelf the former of theſe ways, and ends with the latter. *Grotius* has given us two examples of the like Syntax; and I add this one more out of *Terence*, *Phorm.* Act. 3. Sc. 2. *O fortunatiſſime Antipho, qui quod amas domi eſt.* He ſhould have ſaid, *Qui quod amas domi habes*, or *cui quod amas domi eſt*, *Who haſt what thou loveſt at home.* Such phraſes as theſe have ſomething of that impropriety in them which is frequent in ordinary ſpeech.

Verſ. 24. *Note* b. 1. Our Author tells us as out of *Euſebius*, that there died during the Siege of *Jeruſalem* eleven millions of People, *i. e.* ten times more than there did according both to *Euſebius* and *Joſephus*'s account, who reckon up but eleven hundred thouſand. 2. The words in *Euſebius* which the *Doctor* tranſlates *to be ſlaves there*, are εἰς τὰ καλ' Αἴγυπτον ἔργα, which *Henr. Valeſius* renders *ut metalla exercerent*, *to work in the Mines*, and ſo they ought to be interpreted. 3. *Euſebius* is miſtaken in the laſt Circumſtance, and diſagrees with *Joſephus* whom he profeſſes to follow; for that Hiſtorian tells us, that the number of thoſe that were taken during the *whole War* was ninety ſeven thouſand, *Lib.* 7. *c.* 45. *de Bell. Jud.* which was very ill underſtood by *Euſebius* of thoſe.

Chapter XXII. those that were made Captives after the taking of the *City*. Besides that *Euseb.* reckons but 90000, whereas *Josephus* reckons 7000 more.

Ibid. *Note* c. The phrase Καιροὶ ἐθνῶν may, I think, much more naturally be understood of the time in which the Heathens, *i. e.* the Idolaters should continue the Governors of the World, as if the meaning of *Christ's* words was this: Jerusalem *shall be possessed and inhabited by Idolaters until the time during which the Idolaters must govern the World is expired; for then it shall be inhabited and possessed for the most part by Christians*; which came to pass in the time of *Constantin*, who ordered the Temples of the Idols which were in *Jerusalem* to be destroyed. See his *Life* as it is written by *Eusebius*, Lib. 3. c. 26. Καιροὶ ἐθνῶν signifies the time during which the Nations were to have the supreme Authority in the World; as afterwards *Chap.* xxii. 53. of this Gospel, *Christ* speaking to those who had apprehended him, saith, *This is your Hour*, i. e. the time in which you may do to me what you please. That ἔθνη here should be taken for *Idolaters*, is not strange, because all *Nations* besides *Judæa* where wholly given up to Idolatry. If this conjecture about the sense of this place be not true, I am sure Dr. *Hammond's* interpretation of it is less likely to be so.

Vers. 25. Ἠχέοντος θαλάσσης.] *The Sea*, saith *Grotius*, in the Books of the Prophets, *signifies the state of the World when it is troubled with various events*: I do not think it has any reference to that. But the Prophets used, when they describe any great alteration, to speak in the words of *Juvenal*, *Miscere cœlum terrâ & mare cœlo*, i.e. to represent the changes that are made in Mankind by the motions of the Heavens, Earth and Sea; see *Isa.* xiii. For the same reason I should refuse to interpret *the powers of Heaven* spoken of in the next Verse, of the Christian Churches: We must take all these Metaphors together, and not examin each singly by it self, as if there was something particular signified by every one of them.

CHAP. XXII.

Vers. 6. *Note* a. Ἐξωμολόγησε signifies *he accepted the Reward offered him*, or *he agreed to the Bargain*; for ὁμολογία is ordinarily taken for a *Bargain* or *Agreement*, as *Stephanus* has proved by many examples. In the 2 *Cor.* ix. 13. it signifies *consent*, as the same Author observes. And the *old Glosses* render it by *stipulatus*, *pactio*, *convenientia*, *covenanting*, *bargaining*, *agreeing*; the Verb Ἐξομολογεῖν includes indeed a Promise: and the Greeks used that word in Bargains or Contracts, where the Latins used *promitto* and *spondeo*.

ſpondeo. After the propoſing of the Terms, the propoſer demanded of the other party, whether he would *ſpondere engage*, or *promittere promiſe* to ſtand to thoſe Terms; and the anſwer was *ſpondeo, promitto.* Thus the *Latins* uſed to ſpeak, but the *Greeks* made uſe of the word ὁμολογῶ or ἐξομολογῶ, *i. e.* not properly indeed *I promiſe*, but *I conſent.* The *Cambridg* Copy has ὡμολόγησεν which is moſt common, and ſignifies often the ſame with *conſenting* or *agreeing about a price*, ὁμολογῶν μισθὸν, after the propoſal of it as it was here, as appears by the foregoing Verſe: See the Greek Index to *Xenophon* made by *Æmil. Portus*, and to *Dionyſius Halicarn.* Ant. Rom. by *F. Sylburgius*, in which there are a great many examples given of this ſignification: Ἐξωμολόγησεν therefore here ſignifies, he conſented to the Price, and Dr. *Hammond* has manifeſtly miſſed the ſenſe of it. Chapter XXII.

Verſ. 26. *Note* d. The phraſe Εἶναι ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, ſignifies to ſerve the intereſts of the reſt, as *young People* uſed to obey the commands of their *Seniors.* Tho πρεσβύτερος be a name not only of Age but of Dignity, yet I have never ſeen it demonſtrated by any example hitherto, that thoſe who are deſtitute of any Office are called νεώτεροι, without any reſpect had to their Age. The places which the *Doctor* refers us to, do not in the leaſt prove what he would have them, for they may all be very well underſtood concerning *Age.*

Verſ. 52. *Note* g. For the reconciling of *Joſephus* with St. *Luke*, and ſo the underſtanding of the Evangeliſt's words, it muſt be obſerved that there were two Gariſons placed in the Temple, which had their ſeveral Captains; one conſiſted of *Levites*, who kept guard in the Temple night and day, down from the time of *David*, as appears from 2 *Chron.* viii. 14. For that there was a guard kept in the 2*d* Temple, the *Talmudiſts* aſſure us in *Cod. Middoth*, Chap. 1. §. 1 and 2. And the Captain of this Gariſon was a *Jew*, whom the *Talmudiſts* call איש הר בית *the Man of the Mountain of the Houſe*, or ראש המשמר *the head of the Watch*, as appears from the forementioned place in the *Talmud.* And this Man might have other inferior Captains under him, whom he ſet over each ſingle Band or Guard, which are all called by St. *Luke* στρατηγοὶ ἱεροῦ *Captains of the Temple*; who nevertheleſs calls the chief Captain in the ſingular Number στρατηγὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, *Act.* iv. 1. & v. 24. So that it is not to be wondred at if *Joſephus* gives the ſame title to *Jews*, this Office belonging only to them: And hence we ſee that the Captain or Captains of the Temple are always by St. *Luke* joined with the *Prieſts* and Princes of the *Jews.* Now it was lawful for the *Sanhedrim*, who might employ for that purpoſe the *Levites* which kept watch about the Temple, to apprehend any Jew, and caſt

Chapter XXIII. caſt him into Priſon, if he offended againſt the Law; tho they had no power to put him to death, as appears from the Hiſtory of *Chriſt's* Paſſion, and the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*.

But beſides this, there was a Roman Gariſon put into the Tower called *Antonia*, which had a *Roman Tribune* for its Captain, not a Jew. And this St. *Luke* makes mention of *Acts* xxi, and xxii. The Soldiers that were under the command of this Captain are ſtiled *Mat.* xxvi. 65. κοῦδία, a word borrowed from the Romans, either becauſe they were themſelves Romans, or elſe becauſe they had taken an Oath of Fidelity to the Romans. Theſe were under the Procurators Authority, and obeyed him and their Tribunes and Centurions only; not the στρατηγὸν τῦ ἱερῦ, who was a Jew, and commanded only the Levites.

But it may be demanded perhaps why the Captain of the Guard of Levites is called στρατηγὸς, which properly ſignifies a *military Captain* or *Commander*, whereas the *Levites* were no Soldiers? And this is undoubtedly the reaſon why Dr. *Hammond* thought it was the *Tribune* who was ſet over the *Roman Gariſon* that was called by that name. But he and others who have fallen into the ſame miſtake, ſhould have remembred that the ſacred Functions of the *Levites* are more than once ſtiled by *Moſes* a *Warfare*, צבא: See *Num.* viii. 24, 25. where the *Septuag.* have λειτουργία. And therefore he that was chief over the *Levites* might very well be called שר הצבא, which in Greek is uſually rendred by στρατηγὸς. See the *Doctor* upon Chap. xxiii. 11. *Note* a.

CHAP. XXIII.

Verſ. 11. *Note* a. HAVE a care of thinking that στρατεύω ever ſignifies to *ſerve*, or στράτημα *Servants*. The Hebrew word צבא which is applied ſometimes to the ſervice of the *Levites*, is therefore made uſe of becauſe it ſignifies *congregari to aſſemble* or *gather together*, as the *Levites* uſed to do about the Tabernacle or Temple; or becauſe they were God's gariſon Soldiers, who came together for the defence of the Temple, not becauſe that word ever ſignifies *to ſerve*. *Timothy* is called *a good Soldier*, not ſimply as a *Servant* of *God*, but as a *fighter* in *God's* cauſe: tho the thing conſidered in it ſelf be the ſame, yet the ſignifications of words are various; and it is not all one whether we ſay *a Servant* or *a Soldier*, tho both may be ſaid ſometimes of the ſame Perſon. Our Author therefore here looked for a knot in a Bulruſh, when it had been eaſy to underſtand the word here uſed of *Herod's* guard.

Verſ.

Verſ. 35. Ἐγνω, &c.] The *Cambridg Copy* here reads, Ἐγνως, σεαυτὸν ὅτι εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶ τὸ Θεῦ, εἰ χρειὰς εἶ ὁ ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι: and in a great many other places there is as great a variation as this between it and other Copies, which diſcovers it to be a ſort of a Paraphraſe. Chapter XXIV.

Verſ. 47. Ἐδόξασε τὸν Θεὸν.] *i. e.* He acknowledged the truth, he confeſſed that *Jeſus* was indeed the Perſon whom he would have himſelf believed to be. That this is the meaning of this Phraſe, appears by the following words, *ſaying, truly this was a Juſt Man*; and juſt in the ſame manner it is uſed in *Chap.* v. 26. of this Goſpel, and in *Joſh.* vii. 19. And therefore *Grotius* who interprets it, *he acknowledged the power of God*, and our *Author* who follows him in his Paraphraſe, are miſtaken.

CHAP. XXIV.

Verſ. 16. Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο.] *i. e.* Their ſorrow was ſo great that they had not ſufficiently taken notice, nor looked ſtedfaſtly enough upon the Man that had joined himſelf to their Company, to know him to be *Jeſus*. So *Hagar* was ſo overwhelmed with Grief at the thoughts of her Son's dying, that ſhe did not ſee, or did not take notice of the Well of Water that was juſt by her, *Gen.* xxi. 19. And ſo when it is ſaid afterwards, *Verſ.* 31. of this *Chapter*, that the ſame Diſciples Eyes *were opened*, διηνοίχθησαν, the meaning is nothing but this, that looking more ſtedfaſtly upon *Chriſt*, they knew him; which very Phraſe is uſed in the ſtory of *Hagar* in the ſame ſenſe.

Verſ. 19. Δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ.] *i. e.* Pious and Eloquent, not like the *Phariſees* who talked very big of Virtue, without practiſing it; and were powerful men in *words*, but not in *works*, which was the general reproach caſt upon the Philoſophers among the Heathens. *Cebes Thebanus* in his Table, deſcribing a true Philoſopher, tells us, that he is ἀνὴρ ἔμφρων καὶ δεινὸς περὶ σοφίαν, λόγῳ τε καὶ ἔργῳ; *a prudent Man, and mighty in Wiſdom both in Word and Deed:* See *Acts* vii. 22.

Verſ. 23. Λέγουσι καὶ ὀπτασίαν Ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, οἳ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν.] Theſe two Diſciples of *Chriſt* do not ſeem to have ſpoken with the Women themſelves, but only to have heard the report of others, by which means they came to know but half the Truth; for the Women affirmed that they had alſo ſeen *Jeſus* himſelf. Nor can this ſeem ſtrange, ſince it is evident from the 21*ſt verſe*, that theſe Diſciples went from *Jeruſalem* the ſame day that *Chriſt* roſe from the Dead, a very few Hours after his Reſurrection, and ſo could not have a perfect knowledg of all the Circumſtances of it.

Chapter XIV.

Verſ. 28. Πεφοπευέσθω.] See my Notes on *Gen.* xix. 2.

Verſ. 29. Καὶ παρεβιάσαντο.] *i. e.* they beſought him inſtantly; ſo 2 *Kings* v. 16. *Naaman* the *Syrian* παρεβιάσατο *urged* or *importuned Eliſha* to take the Gift which he refuſed, for curing him of his Leproſy: See note on *Chap.* xiv. 23.

Verſ. 31. Ἀφαντος ἐγένετο.] *i. e.* he went out of the Room on a ſudden, and they could not poſſibly underſtand whether he was gone: for it is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that he became inviſible before he went out of the Room. *Pindar* uſes the ſame word of *Pelops* who had conveyed himſelf away, but certainly without becoming inviſible; *Olympion.* 1. ἄφαντος ἔπλετ, ſaith he, *you diſappeared.* So afterwards *verſ.* 36. of this Chapter, ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν is, *he came amongſt them* on a ſudden and before they were aware.

Verſ. 45. Διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν.] *viz.* by his explaining the Scriptures to them, whereby they came to perceive that there were ſeveral things ſpoken of *Chriſt*, which they did not before take notice of. For *Chriſt* had not as yet given them the *Holy Ghoſt*; and it appears from *Acts* i. 6. that after all theſe Diſcourſes of his, they did not underſtand the nature of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom. In my *Ars Critica*, I have interpreted this Phraſe more at large.

Verſ. 46. Καὶ εἶπεν, &c.] St. *Luke* who often omits ſeveral Circumſtances which are related by the other *Evangeliſts*, joins together ſeveral Diſcourſes that were delivered by *Chriſt* at different times; and here in this place he ſeems to connect theſe words with the foregoing, tho they were ſpoken by Chriſt many days after; for he ſaid the former on the very day of his Reſurrection, but theſe latter were not ſpoken till after the Apoſtles were come back from *Galilee*. Compare theſe things with the Hiſtory of the other *Evangeliſts*.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *John.*

NB. Tho Mr. *Le Clerc* did not inſert this Paraphraſe and Animadverſions on the 18 firſt Verſes of the firſt Chapter of this Goſpel in his Latin Edition of Dr. *Hammond*, becauſe it had been publiſh'd twice before; yet 'twas thought fit, for the convenience of Engliſh Readers, and to make the Work more complete, to put it here in its proper place.

The Author's Preface to the 2*d* Edition of his Paraphraſe on the firſt eighteen Verſes.

I *Have already in the firſt Edition of this little Commentary, given the Reaſons which induced me to publiſh it, and therefore I ſhall not here repeat them. I freely give my conſent to the reprinting of it, becauſe it is my intereſt to have my thoughts concerning the beginning of St.* John's *Goſpel publickly known. I have ſo confuted* Socinus, *as yet ſufficiently to intimate, that I intend not to publiſh any Theological Diſputations about thoſe things in which I diſagree with him; and have expreſly ſaid ſo in a former Preface to theſe Animadverſions. For that reaſon I have not affirmed, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, do not* ὑφίστασθαι *in one and the ſame manner, but that each has his peculiar* ὑπόστασις: *Nor was I under any obligation to do ſo from the thing it ſelf; for* Philo *to whom St.* John *ſeems to have had a reſpect* (in the beginning of this his Goſpel) *did not deny that the* Father, *the* firſt begotten Son, *and the* Soul of the World, *had their ſeveral diſtinct* ὑποστάσεις. *The Evangeliſt corrects only what that Alexandrian Philoſopher ſaid concerning* Reaſon, *or the* Son.

Some have been disgusted with my rendering the Greek word, which is usually translated Word, *or* Sermo *discourse, by* Reason. *But I intreat them first throughly to consider the Reasons I have given for that rendring of it, and then to remember that the word* λόγος *is in it self ambiguous, and may as well be translated* Reason *as* Word. *And tho this latter signification obtained in the West, because of the unskilfulness of the old Latin Interpreter, or, if you please, the poverty of the Latin Language; yet the Greek Fathers do shew, when they treat of this matter, that they understood* Reason *by it, no less than* Word: *see* Dion. Petav. Dogm. Theolog. T. 2. Lib. 6. c. 1.

Nay the Latin Fathers also themselves, who examined the Greek word made use of by St. John, *do acknowledg* that we ought rather *to understand* Reason *by it, than what the Latins call* Verbum, *when they say that they do not understand by it* λόγον προφορικὸν verbum prolatum, *but* ἐνδιάθετον in-situm; *or an* internal, *not an* external *word: for what is* an internal word *but Reason, or reasoning? Besides, the whole Christian Church, both Greek and Latin, do frequently confound the word* λόγος with σοφία Wisdom, *which is the same with Reason, but vastly different from* a word uttered *or* pronounced. *So that tho I have receded in some measure from the custom of the Latins as to the sound, yet not at all as to the thing it self.*

If any object that the word Reason *signifies rather a Quality than a Substance, let them shew me that the term* Word *is any fitter than that to signify a Substance, and I engage to revoke publickly all that I have said: But if any one think he may make use of an improper word, because it was generally used by the* Latin, *and those unlearned men, let him give me leave to make use of one that is altogether as proper, because it was constantly used by the most learned* Greek *Fathers. In the mean time let him permit me to intend by the word* Reason that which, *if he were asked the meaning of the term* Word, *he would be forced to express by* internal discourse, *i. e. reasoning.* And *lastly let him hear what* Tertullian *says, in* Lib. adversus Praxeam, Cap. 5. *where he discourses thus:* Ceterum ne tunc quidem solus *(Deus, nempe, erat)* habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso; *Rationem* suam, scilicet. *Rationalis* etiam Deus, & *Ratio* in ipso prius; & ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ *Ratio* sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus. Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis (i. e. *imperitiam interpretandi)* Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse; cum magis *Rationem* competat antiquiorem haberi; quia non *Sermonalis* à principio, sed *Rationalis* Deus, etiam ante principium; & quia ipse quoque sermo *Ratione* consistens, priorem eam, ut substantiam

ſtantiam ſuam, oſtendat, &c. But neither then was he alone (*viz. God*) for he had with him his *Reaſon*, which he had within himſelf. God is *Rational* alſo, and *Reaſon* was before in him; and ſo all things were of him. Which *Reaſon* is his Senſe. This the Greeks call Λόγος, which word alſo we uſe to ſignify *Sermo*. And therefore it is become the common cuſtom among us, through a ſimplicity of interpretation (*i. e. an unskilfulneſs in interpreting*) to ſay that *Diſcourſe*, *Sermo*, was in the beginning with God, whereas it would be more proper to ſay, that Reaſon was ſo which is more antient; becauſe God was in the beginning not *ſermonal*, but *rational*, even before the beginning; and becauſe Diſcourſe it ſelf depending upon *Reaſon*, does ſhew that to be prior to it, as its ſubſtance, *&c.*

Chapter I.

CHAP. I.

SOME who have joined the ſtudy of the Heathen Philoſophy, with the Profeſſion of the Jewiſh or Chriſtian Religion, have took upon them to teach a great many things concerning the Divine REASON, LIFE and LIGHT, and the ONLY BEGOTTEN Son of God, which they have inculcated upon their Diſciples as points of Faith of the greateſt moment. And becauſe what they have aſſerted is neither all true, nor all falſe, that we may know what we are to reject, and what we are to admit of, I ſhall in few words ſet down that which is agreeable to the Doctrin of Jeſus Chriſt, before I enter upon his Hiſtory.

Verſe 1. *In the beginning was* REASON, *and that* REASON *was with* GOD, *and* GOD *was that* REASON.

1. It is true, before the Creation of the World, there was REASON, for REASON was then in GOD, yea GOD himſelf, ſince God cannot be without REASON.

2. *The ſame was in the beginning with* GOD.

2. There was, I ſay, REASON in GOD, before the World was created.

3. *All things were made by it, and without it was not any thing made that was made.*

3. For every thing in the World was made with the higheſt REASON; nor can any one thing be inſtanced in, that was created without REASON.

4. *In it was* LIFE, *and this* LIFE *was the* LIGHT *of Men.*

4. Heretofore was lodged only in this REASON, a full and complete knowledg of the way that leads to Eternal LIFE; and this Knowledg wanted only to be communicated to Men, to be a ſufficient LIGHT to guide them in their purſuit after that LIFE.

5. *And*

Chapter I.

5. *And the* LIGHT *ſhineth in darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not.*

5. And now that LIGHT has been brought down upon Earth, amongſt Men, and has ſhined for many years paſt upon the way that leads to LIFE; but the greateſt part of Mankind chuſe rather to wander in the darkneſs of Ignorance than to make uſe of that LIGHT.

6. *There was a Man ſent by God, his name* was *John.*

7. *The ſame came for a Witneſs, to bear witneſs of the* LIGHT, *that all Men through him might believe.*

6, 7. *John* the Son of *Zachrias* was ſent by God to the *Jews*, to ſhew them in whom that LIGHT reſided, and by bearing witneſs to him openly, to induce them to believe on him.

8. *He was not the LIGHT, but* was ſent *to bear witneſs of the LIGHT.*

8. But *John* had not this LIGHT in himſelf, nor was it the end of his Coming, to make Men partakers of that LIGHT; but only by his Teſtimony to procure Credit and Authority to him who had that LIGHT among the Jews.

9. *That* LIGHT *was the true* LIGHT, *which came into the World, and lightneth every Man.*

9. In that Man, and no other reſided this LIGHT, which in the moſt excellent Senſe deſerves only to be ſo called, and which now ſhines among Men; ſo that every one who will but follow this Light may be ſure of being brought to eternal LIFE.

10. *REASON was in the World, and the World was made by it, but the World knew it not.*

10. And he in whom that LIGHT was, converſed for ſome time among Men; but they notwithſtanding their having been created by the Divine REASON which dwelt in that Man, did not diſtinguiſh him from falſe Teachers.

11. *It came to its own, but its own received it not.*

11. Nay he lived amongſt thoſe who alone were called the People and Children of God, and yet they did not know the Doctrin of their God.

12. *But to as many as received it, it gave power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on its Name.*

12. But all that embraced his Divine Revelations, were thereupon made God's People, and taken, tho they were not *Jews*, into the number of his Children.

13. *Who were born not of Blood, nor of the will of the Fleſh, nor of the will of Man, but of God.*

13. Tho they were neither Jews by Birth, nor by Marriages, nor Proſelytes, yet God was pleaſed freely to honour them with that Title.

14. *And that* REASON *was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us, (we beheld its Glory, the glory as of the* ONLY BEGOTTEN *of the Father) full of Grace and Truth.*

14. That

14. That REASON which I before ſpake of, and aſſerted to have been with GOD from the beginning, yea to have been GOD himſelf, and in which was LIFE and the LIGHT of Men, did not always, as I ſaid, conceal it ſelf from us; but by the Man in whom it was, became conſpicuous, and dwelt for ſome time among us. (We ſaw the majeſty of the Divine REASON which was never before beheld, diſcovering it ſelf in that Man, as it became him who is the SON of God, not in that manner that we are, but in a manner peculiar and proper to himſelf alone.) That Eternal REASON made it ſelf viſible and manifeſt to us in him, and ſhewed it ſelf Merciful and Gracious to us. Chapter I.

15. John *bare witneſs of him, and cried, ſaying: This was he of whom I ſpake, He that is to come after me, is preferred before me, becauſe he was before me.*

15. *John* bare witneſs concerning this Man openly, and declared him to be the Perſon whom he had deſcribed in theſe words: He that is to come after me, ſhall be greater than I.

16. *And of his Fulneſs have we all received, and Grace for Grace.*

16. From that Knowledg wherewith the divine REASON hath MOST FULLY enlightned that Man, all the Knowledg that every one of us have, is derived; and by him we are aſſured that the Mercy and Goodneſs of God to us is ſuch, as that for all the GRACE and Favour which he reſolved to ſhew us, and thoſe great Benefits which flow from his Love towards us, he requires nothing in return but a GRATEFUL Mind.

17. *For the Law was given by* Moſes, *but Grace and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt.*

17. For whereas *Moſes* publiſhed Laws, in which he impoſed moſt grievous and burdenſom Rites upon the *Jews*, and threatned with Death thoſe who did not punctually obſerve them; Jeſus who is the true CHRIST, and in whom the Divine REASON reſides, came to aſſure us of the Goodneſs and Mercy of God in pardoning all our paſt Sins, and eaſing us of that intolerable Moſaical Yoke.

18. *No Man hath ſeen God at any time; the* ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, *which is in the boſom of the Father, has been his Interpreter.*

18. Before, that Will or Purpoſe of God was not fully underſtood by any but he of whom I ſpake; the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON of GOD, who was ſingularly and peculiarly beloved by his Father, was ſent by God to declare it to us.

BEFORE I come to enquire ſeverally into the ſenſe of the words here made uſe of by the Evangeliſt, I muſt endeavour to aſcertain ſome things on which the Interpretation I ſhall afterwards give of them, will in a great meaſure depend. As *firſt*, I ſhall examin whether this Goſpel (as I my ſelf think it is, and all the Antients univerſally almoſt affirm) be juſtly attributed to the Apoſtle *John*, there being

Chapter I.

being ſome in our Age, who, treading in the ſteps of the antient *Alogi*, a ſort of *Hereticks* ſo called, and deſcribed by *Epiphanius* in *Hereſ.* 51. endeavour to bring that opinion into queſtion. *Secondly*, I ſhall enquire into the time when it was written. And, *laſtly*, where St. *John* writ it; and what was the occaſion and deſign of his beginning his Goſpel in this manner.

1. That the Apoſtle *JOHN* was the Writer of this Goſpel, the Antients do univerſally, as I ſaid, affirm, whoſe Teſtimony in a matter of this nature cannot by any one be rendered invalid, unleſs he can plainly make it appear, that the Antients were all miſtaken, and ſhew us at the ſame time the occaſion and original of their miſtake. For to juſtify our diſſent from the moſt antient Chriſtian Writers, who ſaw the Diſciples of St. *John*, and teſtify that they heard this affirmed by them; and to charge the Chriſtian Churches of that Age with Error, who read this Goſpel as the genuin product of the Apoſtle *John*; it is not ſufficient to propoſe ſome ſlight conjectures, or ſhew a *Metaphyſical poſſibility*, if I may ſo ſpeak, of their erring. But to make it credible that they were all really miſtaken, and that ſo ſoon after St. *John*'s death, there muſt be thoſe evident proofs given of their miſtake, as none of the weighty reaſons I ſhall hereafter alledg can be thought ſufficient to cope with: For it is abſurd, againſt moſt probable Arguments, and ſuch as in another caſe we ſhould acquieſce in, to object bare ſuſpicions or conjectures which have not the leaſt appearance of likelihood in them, and prefer theſe to the former, merely becauſe the opinion which we have eſpouſed, and are reſolved to maintain, makes it neceſſary for us to think that thoſe conjectures are of great weight. It is juſt as if one that was accuſed of writing bad Latin, upon comparing and examining it with *Livy*'s, who was certainly a very clean Writer, ſhould therefore begin to doubt whether the Hiſtory, which goes under *Livy*'s name, and which all the Antients with one conſent attribute to him, were really his; and propoſing ſome very ſlight conjectures againſt it, ſhould think he had rendered the Authority of that Hiſtory queſtionable; and becauſe it might poſſibly have been written by ſome other, pretend that no body ought to produce any teſtimony out of it ever after. And yet this they do, who, as I underſtand, go about to rob the Apoſtle *John* of that Goſpel, which has always been reckoned his; as I ſhall briefly ſhew, by producing ſome of the moſt antient Teſtimonies to that purpoſe; which are well enough known already to learned Men; but it may be not ſo well to thoſe for whoſe ſake I now write, who ſeldom ſpend much time in reading the Writings of the Antients.

The

The first Testimony I shall mention, and the most antient of all, is at the end of St. *John*'s Gospel it self, *Chap.* xxi. 24. where, after a Prediction delivered by *Christ* concerning the great Age that St. *John* should live to, it is immediately added; οὗτος, &c. THIS *is the Disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we* KNOW *that his Testimony is true.* We may read what *Grotius* says in his Notes on *Chap.* xx. 29. and *Dr. Hammond* on this place it self. Where those great men have shewn that this is the Testimony of the Church of *Ephesus*; whereby it appears that from the very first, this Gospel was thought to be the Apostle *John*'s, even by those who lived and conversed with him; which is a certain evidence of its being genuine, because this Testimony was given by Persons who lived at the time when it was written, and might certainly know who was the Author of it. Nor let any one say that this Testimony, or this whole Chapter was an addition put in by some other a considerable time afterwards, for it is read in all the Copies, and all Interpreters acknowledg it. Chapter I.

Another proof of this may be taken out of *Justin Martyr*, who when a Child might perhaps have seen St. *John* himself. And he in that Apology, which is commonly called his *second*, and which he presented to *Antoninus Pius*, in the year of *Christ* 140. where he describes the sacred Assemblies of the Christians, says, that in them were read τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *the Commentaries of the Apostles*, pag. 98. *Ed. Paris.* & *Colon.* By which he means the *Gospels*, as appears by what he says a little before: οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια, &c. *The Apostles in their Commentaries, which are called the Gospels*, &c. And tho he does not very often cite the Apostles words themselves in those Writings of his which are extant; yet he frequently alludes to them, and particularly to the beginning of St. *John*'s Gospel, from whence he took what he says in several places, about the Λόγος and its *Incarnation*, and which he every where sets down as points of Faith generally received among Christians: Which he durst not to have done, unless he had relied upon the Authority of the Apostles; for who among the Orthodox would have presumed first to use the word λόγος, which was commonly abused by the *Valentinians* and others at that time? Who would have ventured to make use of the word σαρκοποίησις, which might easily, by bad or unwary men, have been perverted to a wrong sense, unless an Apostle had first used it? It belonged only to the Apostles who were the ἐπόπται, *inspectors* of Mysteries, and not to the ordinary sort of *Mystæ*, to use new words in such kind of matters; for they alone might safely

Chapter I. impose new names upon things above the reach of human understanding, who understood them better than others, and so as none ever did without a particular Inspiration. I know indeed this was not observed in later times, but in those first it unquestionably was. Now *Justin* frequently makes mention of the ὁ Λόγος, as all know that have but occasionally read any thing in his Writings. I shall produce only one or two passages out of the forementioned *Apology*. In *pag.* 74. he has these words; ἡ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην θεὸν, καὶ υἱὸς ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶν· ὃς καὶ τέχνῳ σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εἰρήκαμεν. *The first Power next to the Father and Lord of all things God, and the Son is the Reason, which how it became man by being incarnated, I shall afterwards shew.* And hence, *pag.* 83. he affirms, that all mankind who follow the direction of Reason, are also partakers of *Christ*: And adds; οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν· οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς: *They who lived according to reason were Christians, tho they were thought to be Atheists, as among the Greeks* Socrates *and* Heraclitus, *and others like them.* And afterwards, *pag.* 98. Διὰ Λόγου Θεοῦ, saith he, σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχε: *Jesus Christ our Saviour was incarnated by the Reason of God, and had both flesh and blood for our Salvation.* Any body may see that these are manifest allusions to the beginning of this Gospel, and none but an *Ignoramus* will deny it. But there are extant also in that Book the express words of *Christ* as they are related by St. *John*, in *Chap.* iii. 3, 5. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὰς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν. He cites likewise the *Apocalypse* as that Apostle's Work, in *Dial. cum Tryphone*, which yet many have doubted of, tho all agreed as to the Gospel.

Thirdly, Among those who acknowledged the Apostle *John* to be the Writer of this Gospel, I might alledg the Testimony of the *Valentinians*, who, as *Irenæus* tells us, endeavoured to pervert it to their own advantage: For they pretended that St. *John* asserted what they called an *Ogdoas Pleromatis*, in the beginning of his Gospel, and thought, tho erroneously, that he very much confirmed their opinions; which makes it evident however, that before *Irenæus*'s time, this Gospel was vulgarly reputed to be St. *John*'s. See what the *Valentinians* themselves say, in *Irenæus* Lib. 1. c. 1. p. 36.

A *fourth* Testimony may be taken out of *Irenæus* himself, who lived almost at the same time with *Justin*; his words I shall afterwards produce, to avoid repeating them.

The *last* shall be out of *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 24. who relying on the Authority of former Ages, and not merely on his own,

own, or of the Age in which he lived, speaks in this manner: τὸ κατ' Chapter
αὐτὸν Εὐαγγέλιον πᾶσι ἤδη τοῖς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν δηλωθὲν ἐν Ἐκκλησίαις, πρῶτον ἀνομολογεῖσθαι: I.
Let his (viz. St. *John's) Gospel, which is very well known to (all) the Churches under Heaven, be first acknowledged.* And about the latter end of the same *Chapter*, he says; Τῶν δὲ Ἰωάννου συγγεγραμμένων, οὐκ ἡ Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ ἡ προτέρα τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν ἔνδοξα τε καὶ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐπ' ἀρχαίοις ἀναμφιλέκτως ὡμολόγηται: *Of St.* John's *Writings, besides his Gospel, the first of the Epistles is, and always was acknowledged without dispute:* See also *Chap.* xxv. I shall not alledg the Testimonies of any other Writers, because it is certain, that from *Irenæus*'s time this was the general opinion; and if these Testimonies which I have alledged, as one said, be not sufficient, I know not what is. But certain Hereticks, whom *Epiphanius Hæres.* 51. seems to have called ἄλογοι, because they denied the Λόγος, for the same reason, rejecting the Authority of all the Antients, denied St. *John* to be the Author of this Gospel. It were to be wished that *Epiphanius* had given us their right name instead of catching at the ambiguity of the word ἄλογος, to shew his wit. But whoever they were, it is certain they were ignorant Criticks, who for the sake of a preconceived opinion, affirmed this Gospel to be suppositious, which they would have owned to be genuin, if it had not contradicted that opinion. But to pass this by, *Epiphanius* observes that they appeared after the *Cataphryges*, *Quintilians* and *Quartadecimans*, i. e. about the end of the second Century, or the beginning of the third. Nor are they any where mentioned by *Irenæus*, who spends a great many words in praise of St. *John*'s Writings, and would certainly have taken notice of them, if there had been any such persons in his time.

And therefore since they began so late to oppose the Authority of this Gospel, which before was universally owned and received, they ought to have given very clear proofs of its being suppositious, which yet they neither did nor were able to do. For whereas they say in the first place, that St. *John* writ in a singular method; this is plainly nothing to the purpose: for why might not St. *John* use a different way of writing from the rest of the *Evangelists?* But there are a great many puzling difficulties, they tell us, in his account of the last years of Christ's Life. But this is not peculiar to St. *John*, for there are great difficulties also in St. *Luke*'s Chronology, as every one knows; nor can it be denied, that the sacred Historians had generally very little regard to the order of time, in their relation of the Life and Discourses of *Christ*. But that is no Argument that all their Writings are suppositious. The Evangelists, it is plain, did not

Chapter I.

design to make a Chronology, or an exact History of *Christ*'s Life, but only to record his principal Discourses, and the main Circumstances of his Life, and some of his Miracles. But this pretence is confuted by *Epiphanius*, who has shewn that those times of *Christ* may be easily digested by an attentive Reader; and his Animadversions are excellently illustrated by *Petavius*.

But there are some, I understand, who object also against the opinion commonly received about the Writer of this Gospel, That the Discourses of *Christ*, which are recorded in it, are many times more *intricate* and *obscure*, than those which are related in the *other* Gospels, nor so often intermixed with *Parables*. But doubtless all Christ's Discourses, for three years together or thereabouts, were not of the *same* sort, but some were plainer, and others more obscure: and when the clearest of them, and most of his Parables had been already related by the *other Evangelists*, it is no wonder that St. *John* should not have so many Parables as *they*; or that the Discourses which he relates as spoken by *Christ*, have sometimes more obscurity in them than those which *they* have recorded. Besides, the Holy Ghost, by whom the Writers of the Gospels were inspired, that they might not say any thing that was not agreable to Truth, did not alter any thing peculiar to each in their way of speaking or writing, but left them to use their *own stile* in relating the principal heads of *Christ*'s Discourses; and possibly St. *John*'s stile might be more intricate sometimes than ordinary, which is also discernible in his *Epistles*, and in the *Revelations*. There is no body but has observed that St. *Luke* writes the purest Greek, and that there are more Latinisms to be found in *that* Evangelist, than in any of the rest. And so St. *John* likewise has his Peculiarities, as Interpreters, and among the rest *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, have observed.

These being the only Arguments that can be alledged to prove this Gospel to be supposititious; and those being very slight and frivolous, or rather none at all, it is no wonder that the *Alogi* of old had no followers: and I dare say, whoever shall revive their Heresy, and have no better grounds for it than they had, will meet with as few; If they will but lay aside their preconceived opinions, and apply themselves for sometime to the study of Criticks, they will be ashamed of their own rashness. When the *Alogi* were asked who it was that wrote this Gospel, if it was not St. *John*, they answered *Cerinthus*, notwithstanding it was universally reckoned that *Cerinthus*'s Opinion was directly opposite to this Gospel: and the same is pretended now by those who follow the *Alogi*. But their making such an absurd conjecture,

jecture, manifeſtly ſhews what excellent Criticks the Antients and we have to deal with: For it's moſt certain that *Cerinthus*'s error was oppoſed by St. *John*, as I ſhall ſhew on *verſ.* 1. And then can any one be induced to believe, that any thing which was written by ſo deteſted a Perſon as *Cerinthus*, could be ſo obtruded upon the Diſciples of St. *John*, and all the Orthodox, as to be unanimouſly received by all the Chriſtian World for Genuin, not long after St. *John*'s Death? Who will believe that all the Antients were ſo blind as to think an opinion was confuted in a Book that aſſerted it? Theſe things are abſolutely incredible; nor would they have ſeemed leſs ſo to the *Alogi* of old, or now to their followers, than to us, if they had been able then, or could at preſent ſhew that the beginning of this Goſpel does not contradict the opinion of the *Unitarians*; which becauſe they deſpaired of, they reſolved, contrary to all the Rules of Criticks, to deny this Goſpel to be the Apoſtle *John*'s. But with what ſucceſs may be diſcerned from what I have hitherto ſaid, and it is ſuperfluous to add more. Chapter I.

II. The Antients which ſpeak of the time when St. *John* wrote his Goſpel do agree, that it was not written before his departure into the Iſland of *Patmos*; but ſome ſay that it was dictated in that *Iſland*, and publiſhed at *Epheſus*; and others that it was written in that *City* after the Apoſtles return. Now St. *John* was ſent into the Iſle of *Patmos* in the year of Chriſt 94. and thence he returned to *Epheſus* in the year 96. as appears from St. *Jerom* in *Catal. Script. Eccleſ.* And therefore it muſt either have been written between thoſe two years, and afterwards made publick about the end of St. *John*'s Life, or elſe both written and publiſhed at *Epheſus* after the year 97. The Author of the *Synopſis of the Holy Scripture*, whether *Athanaſius* or ſome other, a very antient Writer, tells us that, τὸ κατ' Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπαγορεύθη τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ καὶ ἠγαπημένῳ, ὄντι ἐξορίᾳ ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ὑπὸ Γαΐου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ ξενοδόχου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου: *the Goſpel according to St.* John *was dictated by the holy and beloved Apoſtle* John *himſelf, when he was an Exile in the Iſland* Patmos, *and was publiſhed by him at* Epheſus, *by* Gaius *the beloved and hoſt of the Apoſtles.* But *Suidas* on the word Ἰωάννης affirms, out of a more antient Author, that it was written at *Epheſus*: ὑπὸ δέ, ſaith he, ἐκ Πάτμου ἐξορίας ἀπελθὼν συντάξῃ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὢν ἐτῶν ϙ': *Being returned from his Baniſhment in the Iſle of* Patmos, *he compoſes his Goſpel when he was a hundred years old.* It is no matter to us which of theſe Opinions be true, as long as we are certain that St. *John* wrote his Goſpel about the end of the firſt Century. *Epiphanius* confeſſing, that St. *John* wrote it μετὰ τὸ ἐπιστρέψαντα †

αὐτὸν

Chapter I. αὐτῆς ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ Πάτμῳ ἐπάνοδον, after the ninetieth year of his Age, and after his return out of *Patmos*, erroneously makes that to have been in the reign of *Claudius*, as learned Men have observed: See his words in *Hæres. Alogorum*, which is the 51. *Sect.* 12.

III. By these Testimonies it appears that St. *John* either wrote or published his Gospel at *Ephesus*, which *Irenæus* also expresly affirms, *Lib.* 3. c. 1. Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῇ Ἀσίας διατρίβων: *St.* John *one of our Lord's Disciples, who also leaned upon his Breast, and himself published a Gospel, dwelling at* Ephesus *in* Asia.

If it be enquired on what occasion, and to what end St. *John* began his Gospel, so as we see he does? *Irenæus* answers in these words, *Lib.* 3. *c.* 11. after he had spoken of the other Evangelists: *St.* John *the Disciple of our Lord, designing to extirpate that error which had been sowed* (in mens Minds) *by* Cerinthus, *and a great while before by those that are called* Nicolaitans, *who are a branch of that Heresy, which is falsly called Knowledg,* (γνῶσις from whence they had the name of *Gnosticks*) *that he might confound them, and perswade them, that there is one God who made all things by his Word*, &c. So that St. *John*, if we believe *Irenæus*, began his Gospel so as he did, on purpose to refute the Doctrin of *Cerinthus* and the *Gnosticks*, as he declares afterwards more at large. *Eusebius* in Hist. Eccles. *Lib.* 3. *c.* 24. affirms, that the intention of St. *John* was to fill up what was wanting in the relation of the *other Evangelists:* In his room I shall substitute St. *Jerom*, who in *Catal. Script. Eccles.* has these words: *Novissimus omnium scripsit Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis, adversus Cerinthum, aliósque Hæreticos, & maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse; unde & compulsus est divinam ejus nativitatem edisserere. Sed & aliam causam hujus scripturæ ferunt*, &c. *He wrote his Gospel last of all, at the desire of the Bishops of* Asia, *against* Cerinthus *and other Hereticks, and the Heresy of the* Ebionites *which began to prevail exceedingly at that time, who asserted that Christ was not before the Virgin* Mary; *upon which account also he was forced to declare his Divine Birth. But there is another reason likewise given of this writing*, which is the same I have alledged out of *Eusebius*, and is not to our purpose. The same Author in *Proæm. ad Matthæum*, speaks thus, *Joannes Apostolus & Evangelista* —— *cum esset in* Asia, *&c. St.* John *the Apostle and Evangelist* —— *being in* Asia, *and the Heresies of* Cerinthus, Ebion, *and others, who denied that Christ was come in the Flesh, and whom he also in his Epistle calls Antichrists, springing up at that very time* —— *he was compelled almost by all the then Bishops of* Asia, *and the Messages of many Churches,*

Churches, to write concerning our Saviour's Divinity more particularly —— Chapter
Whence it is also related in Church-History, that being urged by his Bre- 1.
thren to write, he promised that he would, provided they would all keep a fast and implore the assistance of God on his behalf, which being accordingly performed, he was filled with the Holy Ghost, and immediately dictated as from Heaven that Proemium: *In the beginning*, &c.

Altho all these Authors had been silent, we might easily enough have drawn a conjecture from the thing it self: for celebrated Writers, and Sects of Hereticks, having introduced several *Platonick* terms into the Jewish and Christian Religion, before St. *John* wrote; and the Apostle *John* being the first Christian Writer that used those terms in a peculiar Sense, in the beginning of his Gospel; it may be easily conjectured that he alluded to the Doctrin of those Men, and that it was his design to teach Christians in what sense those terms might be made use of. If the Writings of those antient Hereticks were now extant, they would be a great help doubtless to our understanding of this matter; but since they are lost, we can only make use of their fragments which are extant in *Irenæus*, the most antient Writer that has related their Opinions. There are extant also several Books of the famous *Philo Alexandrinus*, who was contemporary with the Apostles, and if we believe some of the Antients, familiar with them; where the same terms are so often used, that I am apt to think St. *John* has as great a respect to him as the forementioned Hereticks. It is certain that all his Writings were published a long while before ever St. *John* wrote; and his eloquence is such, that he was justly had in admiration by all who lived in his time, and is still read by learned Men with great delight. What high Commendations *Josephus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Eusebius*, St. *Jerom*, and others give him, I need not say.

So celebrated a Writer therefore could not be unknown to the Apostle *John*, who dwelt so long at *Ephesus*, in the very *eye* of *Asia*. That he had been carefully read by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, the great *Grotius* has observed. And therefore being often read by the Christians, and having a great many things in him of a near affinity with the Christian Tenets, it was possible that many who were taken with his Eloquence, might imitate him, and mix his Opinions before they were aware with Christianity. To prevent which St. *John* in the beginning of his Gospel, made use of those terms which were most likely to impose on the unwary, that the Christians might understand in what sense they might be used: and how probable this is, will, by comparing the words of the Apostle with those of *Philo*, sufficiently appear.

But

Chapter I.

But before I come to that, I shall endeavour to strengthen this conjecture, by producing some passages out of him parallel to several sayings of *Christ* himself and his Apostles in this Gospel: For the more I shew to be in *Philo* resembling the Discourses of *Christ* and his Disciples, the more likely it will be that he was frequently read and delighted in by the Christians of that Age; and accordingly that St. *John* had a reference to him in the beginning of his Gospel.

1. There is nothing in Christianity that more offends the *Jews*, than our so asserting God to be *one*, as yet to make mention of *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, in whose names we are baptized. And there is something so like this *Tenet* in *Philo*, that you would almost think you were reading the words of some Christians. He seems indeed to speak more agreeably to the opinion which *Arius* afterwards espoused, than of the *Orthodox*, but he came nearer the *Christians* in this matter than the *Jews*, and might easily have imposed upon the unwary. His words are these in *Lib. de Abrahamo*, p. 287. ΠΑΤΗΡ δὲ τῶν ὅλων ἐν μέσῳ, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γεγραπται χωρίοις ἐνίοτε καλεῖται ὁ Ὢν· αἱ δ' περ' ἑκάτερα πρεσβύταται καὶ ἐγγυτάτω τοῦ Ὄντος δυάμεις· ὧν ἡ μὲν πρωτικὴ, ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ ὀνομάζεται· καὶ ἡ μὲν πρωτικὴ ΘΕΟΣ, ταύτῃ γὰρ ἔθηκέ τι καὶ διεκόσμησε τὸ πᾶν· ἡ δὲ βασιλικὴ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, δίκαιον γὰρ ἄρχειν καὶ κρατεῖν τῶν ποιουμένων: *The* FATHER *is in the middle of all, who in Holy Scripture is by a peculiar Name stiled,* the Being: *and on each side are* [two] *most antient Powers next to the Being; whereof one is called the effective* [Power] *and the other Royal; and the Effective,* GOD, *for by this* [the Father] *made and adorned the Universe; and the Royal,* LORD, *for it is fit he should rule and govern what he has made.* And in the next words he asserts also, that God is Three and One: διαφερόμενον δὲ ὁ μόνος ὑφ' ἑκατέρας τῶν δυάμεων σαφέστερον τῇ ὀξυωπεῖ διανοίᾳ τότε μὲν ΕΝΟΣ, τότε ΤΡΙΩΝ φαντασίαν. ΕΝΟΣ μὲν ὅταν ἄμα καθαρθέντα τὸν ψυχὴν, καὶ μὴ μόνον τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἀριθμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν γείτονα μονάδος δυάδα ὑπερβᾶσα σπεύδῃ τῷ ἀμιγεῖ καὶ ἀσυμπλόκῳ, καθ' αὑτὸν ὡσαύτως ἑνιαίῳ ἐπειγομένη ἰδέαν ἐπιζητεῖ. ΤΡΙΩΝ δ' ὅταν μήπω τὰς μεγάλας τελεθείσα τελετὰς ἔτι ἐν ταῖς βραχυτέραις ἐρημάζηται καὶ μὴ δύνηται τὸ Ὂν ἄνευ ἑτέρου τινὸς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ μόνου καταλαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ διὰ δυοῖν ἀναμίσων, ἢ κτίζον, ἢ ἄρχον: *Being therefore attended on both sides with his Powers, to a discerning Understanding he appears one while to be* ONE, *and another while to be* THREE. ONE *when the Mind being in the highest degree purified, and passing over not only a multitude of numbers, but also that which is next to an Unit, the number of two, endeavours after a simple and uncompounded Idea, perfect of it self: and* THREE, *when not as yet sufficiently exercised in great Mysteries, it busies it self about lesser, and is not able to conceive* the Being *without any other of it self, but by his Works, and either as creating or governing.*

This,

This it is certain was thought by learned Men among the *Arians*, to be the very Tenet of the Chriſtians, as may be gathered from what *Euſebius* in *Præp. Evangelica* ſays out of *Philo*. Chapter I.

2. But eſpecially he affirms thoſe things concerning the Divine Reaſon, which as to the words, and ſometimes alſo as to the ſenſe, are very like the Chriſtian Doctrin, of which I ſhall produce ſome examples. He calls *Reaſon* more than once the Πρωτόγονος, as St. *Paul* Col. i. 15. in *Lib. de Agricultura*, *p.* 152. where after he had mentioned the parts of the Univerſe, he tells us that God, ἐφεστήσατο δὲ ὀρθὸν αὐτῷ Λόγον Πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ἵς τὴν ὁπηνίκεαν ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης, οἷά τις μεγάλου βασιλέως ὕπαρχος διαδέξεται, *had ſet over it his right Reaſon, his firſt born Son, who undertook the care of this ſacred Flock as ſome great King's Deputy.*

3. He deſcribes it as executing the Office of a *Mediator* between God and Men, in his Book entitled, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*, p. 396. Τῷ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ Λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκε ὁ τὰ ὅλα γενέσας Πατὴρ, ἵνα μεθόριος ᾖς, τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνῃ καὶ πεποιηκότος. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μὲν ἱστὶ θνητῶν περιόντος ἀεὶ ἀφθάρτου, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν ἀφθάρτου τὸ ὑπήκοον —— ἔτι ἀγένητος ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὤν, ἔτι γενητὸς ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος ἀμφοτέρων, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμηρεύων· ἀφθάρτῳ μὲν φυτεύσαντι, ἀφθάρτου πίστιν καὶ μὴ σύμπαν ἀφανίσαι ποτὲ καὶ ἀπρονόητον τὸ γένος, ἀκοσμίαν ἀντὶ κόσμου ἐλόμενον· φθορᾷ δὲ τῷ φύντι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ μέποτε τὰ ἴλεων θεὸν πεπιδεῖν τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον: *On the Prince of Angels, and moſt antient Reaſon, the Father who created all things, conferred this excellent gift, to ſtand as a Mediator, and divide that which comes to paſs from that which he has made. And he perpetually intercedes for periſhing Mortals with the incorruptible Nature, and is the Princes Embaſſador to his Subjects —— He is neither unbegotten as God is, nor made as we are, but of a middle Nature between both extremes, acting the part of a Surety or Pledg with both; with the Creator, by engaging that Mankind ſhall never all grow corrupt, or rebel, preferring Confuſion to order; and with the Creature, by giving them good hope, that the Merciful God will never overlook or neglect his own Workmanſhip.*

4. Upon this account he calls him alſo Ἀρχιερέα a *High-Prieſt*, in Lib. *de ſomniis*, p. 463. Δύο γάρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἓν μὲν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεοῦ Λόγος· ἕτερον δὲ λογικὴ ψυχή, ἧς ἱερεὺς ἡ ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος: *God ſeems to have two Temples, whereof one is this World, whoſe High-Prieſt is the Divine Reaſon, his firſt begotten Son, and the other the reaſonable Soul, the Prieſt whereof is he that is truly a Man.* In like manner St. *Paul* ſays, that we are the *Temples of God*, 1 Cor. vi. 19. and elſewhere.

5. In the ſame Book, *pag.* 461. *Philo* tells us, that there are τελείου Λόγοι, *viz.* a Divine, and a human ὧν ὁ μὲν ἕτερος καθαίρει καὶ κωφοῖ ψυχὴν

Chapter I. ἁμαρτημάτων, *whereof one* (i. e. the Divine) *purifies and cleanſes the Soul from Sin.*

6. The ſame *Author* in ſeveral places affirms, that the Λόγος is εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, *the Image of God.* So in *Lib.* περὶ κοσμοποιΐας, pag. 11. Τὸν δ' ἀόρατον καὶ αὐτὸν θεῖον Λόγον, καὶ Θεοῦ Λόγου εἰκόνα λέγων Θεοῦ: *The inviſible and intelligible divine Reaſon, and the Reaſon of God, he calls the Image of God,* viz. *Moſes.* So in Lib. *de Somniis*, towards the end, he tells us that thoſe who cannot underſtand God himſelf, yet ſometimes Τὸν δὲ Θεοῦ εἰκόνα ἢ ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸν καταλαβεῖν, *do underſtand the Image of God, his Angel Reaſon, as himſelf.* And elſewhere he gives the ſame deſcription of the Λόγος, which St. *Paul* alſo called *the Image of the inviſible God, the Firſt-born of every Creature:* ſee Lib. *de Profugis*, p. 363.

7. In his Book inſcribed, *Quod pejus eſt meliori inſidiatur*, he ſays, that the Lawgiver (viz. *Moſes*) καλεῖ μάννα, τὴν πρεσβυτάτην τῶν ὄντων Λόγον Θεῖον, *calls by the name of Manna the moſt antient of all Beings, the divine Reaſon:* ſee alſo Lib. 2. *de Allegoriis Legis*, p. 70. & ſeqq. So in his Book intitled, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres*, pag. 784. he interprets τὸ μάννα by τὸν Θεῖον λόγον, τὴν ἐφετὸν φιλοθεάμονος ψυχῆς ἀφθαρτον τροφήν: the *divine Reaſon, the celeſtial and incorruptible Food of a contemplative Soul.* Which compare with the words of *Chriſt* in *John* vi. 31. & *ſeqq.* There are many other things in *Philo*, reſembling the Chriſtian Doctrin, which I ſhall not here tranſcribe; for what I have alledged out of him περὶ Λόγου, is over and above ſufficient to ſhew the poſſibility of his leading the Chriſtians into an error by his Eloquence, if it were not prevented by the Apoſtles Authority. I ſhall now endeavour to interpret St. *John*'s words, and ſhew that in many things he had a reſpect to *Philo.*

Verſ. 1. *In the beginning was*] Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν. Tho the word ἀρχὴ be in the number of thoſe which ſignify τὰ πρός τι, or in the language of the Schools, *relatives*; it is not therefore to be thought that it refers to the Argument or Subject of this Book, which is the Goſpel. According to all the rules of Grammar we ought rather to regard the ſignification of the words which immediatly follow, and their connexion. And here the following words are Λόγος, *and all things were made by it*; and the Evangeliſt ſays, *the World was made by it*; which ſhews that he ſpeaks of the beginning of all things, or of the Creation of the World. None of thoſe that made uſe of the word Λόγος in this ſenſe, *viz.* for a Nature, which *is with God, and is God*, could underſtand theſe words otherwiſe, becauſe they attributed, as I ſhall afterwards ſhew, the Creation of the World to *Reaſon.* And no wiſe

man

man ought to take uncommon phraſes in a quite different ſenſe from that wherein they are underſtood by thoſe who moſtly uſe them, and yet never warn the Reader of his underſtanding them otherwiſe. Nor is it the part of a skilful Interpreter to underſtand Phraſes in a perfectly new and unuſual ſenſe, unleſs it manifeſtly appears by the Writer whom he interprets, that they ought to be ſo underſtood. Chapter I.

Ibid. *Reaſon*] Λόγος. So I interpret the Greek word, and not by *Verbum the Word*, or *Sermo Speech* or *Diſcourſe*; becauſe thoſe who firſt and moſtly uſed it to ſignify a divine Mind, or God himſelf, did never mean by it a Nature ſpeaking in the Name of God, but only underſtanding and diſpoſing all things into order. *Timæus Locrus*, a *Pythagoræan*, who perhaps firſt uſed this word, in his deſcription of the Creation of the World ſpeaks thus: Πρὶν μὲν οὐρανὸν γενέσθαι ΛΟΓΩ ἦσαν ἰδέα τε καὶ ὕλα, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δημιουργὸς τοῦ βελτίονος. *Before therefore the Heaven was made, there were in Reaſon the Idea and Matter, and God the Creator of a better.* So *Epicharmus* the Comædian, in his *Commonwealth*, as he is cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Strom. Lib. 5.

Ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ λογισμὸς, ἔστι καὶ θεῖος Λόγος.
Ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώπῳ πίστις ἐς βίον καὶ τὰς τύχας·
Ὁ δ' ἁμὰ τὰς τέχνας ἅπαν συνέπεται θεὸς Λόγος,
Ἐδιδάσκων αὐτὸν αὐτὸς, ὅ, τι ποιῶν δεῖ συμφέρει.
Οὐ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος τέχναν εὗρ', ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντας φέρει·
Ὁ δέ γε τ' ἀνθρώπου λόγος πίστις ἐστὶ τῷ θείῳ Λόγῳ.

Which *Grotius* interprets thus;

Eſt humana ratio; hanc præter eſt & divina altera.
Ratio humana circa vitam & victum ſemet occupat;
At divina Ratio eſt artis opifex & comes omnibus,
Edocens ipſos quid uſus maxime facto ſiet.
Quippe homo non reperit artem, ſed dat hanc auctor Deus,
Ipſaque illa humana ratio nata eſt ex ratione Dei.

Plato, *Timæus*'s Interpreter, and *Epicharmus*'s Imitator, in his *Timæus*, calls likewiſe the Λόγος, λογισμὸς, *reaſoning*, p. 528. *Ed. Gen.* of *Ficinus*: ὅτῳ δὴ πᾶς ὄντως ἀεὶ λογισμὸς θεῷ ——— λογισθείς: *All this true reaſoning of God —— being reaſoned*, &c. But in his *Epinomis* he uſes the word Λόγος, ſpeaking of the World: ὃν ἔπαξε, ſaith he, Λόγος ὁ πάντων δεσπότης ἐφεῦρε. The *Stoicks* who, as *Diogenes Laertius* tells us, in *Lib.* 7. *Sect.* 135 & 136. affirmed, εἶναι θεὸν καὶ νοῦν, καὶ εἱμαρμένην καὶ Δίκα,

Chapter I.

πολλαῖς τε ἐπίσης ὀνομασίαις προσονομάζεσθαι, *That it was the same thing which was called God, and the Mind, and Fate, and Jupiter, and by a great many other names*, said also that God καὶ ἀρχὰς σπερματικὸν ὃν λόγον τῶν κόσμου, did *in the beginning, being the seminal Reason of the World, dispose all things.* The same Author, in *Sect.* 134. says, it was the Doctrin of the *Stoicks*, that there were two Principles of all things, *viz.* an Active and a Passive; the latter of which was Matter or Substance without any Quality; Τὸ δὲ ποιοῦν τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ. Τοῦτον γὰρ ὄντα ἀΐδιον διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς δημιουργεῖν ἕκαστα; but the former, *viz. the Active*, was REASON, *which was in it, and which was* GOD; *for this being eternal, out of all that* (*viz.* Matter, *or* Passive principle) *formed every thing.* And to this Doctrin of the *Stoicks*, *Tertullian* in *Apol.* cap. 21. had a respect, when he says; *Apud vestros quoque sapientes* Λόγον, *id est, Sermonem atque Rationem, constant artificem videri Universitatis. Hunc enim Zenon determinat factitatorem, qui cuncta in dispositione formaverit; eundem & fatum vocari & Deum & animum Jovis, & necessitatem omnium rerum. It is well known that also among your wise men,* Λόγος, i. e. *Speech and Reason, was thought to have been the maker of the Universe. For this* Zeno *affirms to have been the Creator, who formed and disposed all things, and was called Fate, and God, and the Mind of Jupiter, and the Necessity of all things.* There was no need of joining the word *Sermo* to *Ratio*, to render the Greek word Λόγος; for what place could there be for *Speech* in the Creation and Disposition of the Universe? But there was for *Reason*; and therefore *Seneca* setting down the Opinion of *Plato* and the *Stoicks*, makes frequent mention of that, as in *Ep.* 65. *Causa autem*, saith he, *id est Ratio, materiam format, & quocunque vult versat*——*Quærimus quid sit causa? Ratio faciens, id est, Deus*, &c. *The cause, that is Reason, formeth Matter, and turns* or *diversifies it how it pleases*——*If you ask what is meant by Cause, it is Reason creating, that is, God.* And in *Lib. de Vita Beata*, cap. 8. he stiles it, *incorporalis Ratio ingentium operum artifex*; *incorporeal Reason, the Author of great Works.* Consult also *Philo* wherever he speaks of the Λόγος, and the Creation of the World, and we shall see that he never understands *Speech* by it, but only *Reason.* See his Book *de mundi opificio*, where he says that it was the intelligible Pattern of the World, and had no other place, ἢ τὸν Θεῖον Λόγον τὰ τοῦτα διακοσμήσαντα, *than the divine Mind or Reason which disposed those things:* Other Passages out of him I shall produce afterwards. I might alledg also the Testimonies of Modern Platonicks, and Ecclesiastical Writers to this purpose, but that I have determined to shew only how the Antients used this word. The *Jews* who were more antient than *Philo* himself, called *Angels*, both

both good and bad, Λόγος, which is the same as if they had said, λογικὰς δυνάμεις, *Powers endued with Reason*, not *with Speech*; which *Philo* also imitated. So the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, Chap. xviii. 15, 16. speaking of the revenging Angel that was sent against the *Egyptians*, says: ὁ παντοδυναμός σου λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐκ θρόνων βασιλείων, &c. *Thine almighty Reason leapt down from Heaven out of thy Royal Throne, as an inexorable Warrior, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned Commandment as a sharp Sword, and standing up filled all things with Death; and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the Earth*, &c. The Writer of this Book attributes a *Throne* to this Angel, in agreement with the custom of the *Eastern* Nations, who called Angels *Thrones*. Otherwise he imitates *Homer*, who *Iliad* Δ, *vers.* 443. speaking of *Iris*, saith: Οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει· *She fixes her head in the Heaven, and walks upon the Earth.* Chapter I.

I know indeed there are some Interpreters who would make St. *John* to have a respect to the Expression of *Moses*, who represents God as creating the World by *speaking* or *saying*. But tho *Moses* teaches us, that God made all things, as it were, by a Command, yet it is manifest he does not mean *speech* properly so called, as I have shewn in my Notes on *Gen.* Ch. i. So that it would be but a dull Allusion to say upon that account, that *the Word was with God*, yea, *God himself*; nor are there any such Allusions observable in St. *John*'s stile.

Ibid. *And that Reason was with God.*] Καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. It is said here, that Reason was with God, by way of *antithesis* or opposition to what is afterwards said concerning the manifestation of the divine Reason among men. Afterwards it was πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, when it dwelt in *Jesus Christ*, nay πρὸς ἀνθρώπους; forasmuch as *Christ* conversed with men, and by the inspiration of the divine Reason called them to a better life. I might produce out of *Plotinus*, if he were not a late Author, a like expression, πρὸς τὸν Νοῦν, or Λογον. But I shall alledg only the words of *Ignatius*, in his genuin Epistle *ad Magnesios*, concerning *Jesus Christ*, pag. 33. *Ed. Voss.* ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ Πατρὶ ἦν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη; *who before* [all] *Ages was with the Father, but in the end appeared.* Which words allude to this place in St. *John*, and may serve instead of an interpretation of it, as also what he says a little after: εἷς Θεός ἐστιν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ Λόγος ἀΐδιος: *There is one God, who has revealed himself by Jesus Christ his Son, which is his eternal Reason.*

Ibid. *God was that Reason.*] Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. St. *John* adds this, lest it should be thought that there was any thing besides the Divine Nature before the Creation of the World. *Philo* also calls the λόγος God,

Chapter I. God, in Lib. *de Somniis*, p. 465. on these words in *Genes.* xxxi. 13. *I am the God that appeared to thee, in the place of God.* Καλεῖ δὲ, saith he, τὸν Θεὸν τὸ πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ Λόγον· *That which the* [Scripture] *calls God, is his most antient Reason.* But there is this difference between St. *John* and *Philo*, that *Philo* would have the Λόγος to be called God only abusively, or improperly; for a little before he saith: ὁ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν· οἱ δὲ κατὰ χρῆσιν γινόμενοι πολλοί: *He that is truly God is one; those that are abusively so, are many.* And after the words before alledged, he subjoins that the Scripture does not, δεισιδαιμονεῖν περὶ τὴν θέσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων, *is not superstitious about the imposing of names.* But St. *John* teaches us, that *Reason* not only was *from the beginning*, and *with God*, by which word he understands him who is in the most excellent sense so called, but adds, as it were, κατὰ διόρθωσιν, *by way of correction*, *And that Reason was God*; which, according to *Philo*, could only be said improperly. And indeed *Philo* every where makes his λόγος inferior to the most high God; whereas St. *John* asserts the λόγος, which he says conversed afterwards with men, to have been the one only true God, properly so call'd. And this he says also in opposition to *Cerinthus*, of whom *Irenæus* in *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 25. speaks thus: *But one* Cerinthus *in* Asia *affirmed that the World was not made by the supreme God, but by a certain Power separate and very distant from that Principality which is over all things, and which did not know him who is over all things, God.* See also *Lib.* 3. *c.* 11. For if *Reason* be *God*, even that *God with whom it was* from the beginning; and if Reason made the World, as St. *John* affirms, then *Cerinthus* was manifestly mistaken.

Vers. 2. *The same was in the beginning with God.*] These words St. *John* repeats out of the foregoing Verse, for the sake of connexion, being about to say, that all things were made by Reason.

Vers. 3. *All things were made by it.*] Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. This is nothing to *Cerinthus*, who did not deny that all things were made by Reason; but it is said, that the Christians might understand it to be true, what *Philo* and others before him among the *Jews*, asserted concerning the Creation of the World by the λόγος. He opposes the Doctrin of the *Epicureans*, who contended that all things were made by Chance, and without Reason. That this was the opinion of *Epicurus*, contrary to the sentiments of most other Philosophers, and particularly of *Plato*, every one knows, and it is needless to prove. *Lucretius* also, in *Lib.* 5. expressly denies that the Universe was made by *Reason*, where he affirms that it is senseless to say,

——*Deúm quod sit* Ratione *vetustâ*
Gentibus humanis fundatum —— That

That the [World] *was founded for Mankind by the antient Reaſon of the Gods.* In which he has a reſpect to the *Platoniſts*, who uſed ſo to ſpeak, as the following words ſhew, in which he denies that *God* had *exemplum gignundis rebus ullum, any Pattern to make the World by.* So that according to the Opinion of *Epicurus*, the World was produced χωρὶς λόγου, *without Reaſon*; or as *Plutarch, de Philoſ. Placitis*, Lib. 1. c. 4. ſpeaks, ἀπὸ ἀτόμων σωμάτων ἀτρεμήτων καὶ τυχαίαν ἐχόντων τὴν κίνησιν, *by indiviſible Bodies having an unforeſeen and fortuitous motion.* But *Lactantius* ſpeaking of this Opinion in Lib. *de ira Divina*, cap. 10. after he had deſcribed the beauty of the Univerſe, and proved it to have been created by God, againſt *Leucippus* and *Epicurus*, very well ſays, *Tanta ergo qui videat & talia, poteſt exiſtimare nullo effecta eſſe conſilio, nulla providentia, nulla* RATIONE *divina, ſed ex atomis ſubtilibus, exiguis concreta eſſe tanta miracula? Can therefore one that beholds ſuch and ſo great things,* think *that they were made with no deſign, no foreſight, no divine* REASON, *but that all theſe great Miracles were produced by the conjunction of ſubtil ſmall Atoms?* And *Inſtit. Divin.* Lib. 1. c. 2. after he had ſaid that *Democritus* and *Epicurus* thought all things were made and are governed by Chance, he ſubjoins a little after, *Quos tamen & ceteri Philoſophi ac maxime Stoici, acerrime retuderunt, dicentes nec fieri mundum* SINE *divina* RATIONE *potuiſſe; nec conſtare, niſi ſummâ* RATIONE *regeretur. Whom yet the reſt of the Philoſophers, and particularly the* Stoicks, *did moſt ſharply oppoſe, affirming that the World could neither have been made without the divine* REASON, *nor conſiſt unleſs it were governed by the higheſt* REASON. And *Lib.* 3. c. 17. he expreſſes again the Opinion of *Epicurus* thus; *Nihil in procreandis animalibus Providentiæ* RATIO *molita eſt,* REASON *uſed no foreſight in the producing of living Creatures.* In oppoſition to which he ſays a little after, *Non poteſt quidquam rationale perficere niſi* RATIO, *Nothing but* REASON *can make any rational being.* Chapter I.

But let us return now to the *Jews*, and particularly to *Philo*, who ſpeak in the ſame manner as St. *John*: So the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom*, cap. ix. 1. addreſſes himſelf to *God* thus; ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ΠΑΝΤΑ ἐν λόγῳ σου, καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον: *who haſt made* ALL THINGS *by thy Reaſon, and adorned Man by thy Wiſdom.* And *Philo* Lib. 2. *de Monarchia*, p. 736. ſaith, Λόγος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, διὰ ἧς σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο: *Reaſon is the Image of God, by which the whole World was created.* But there is this difference between St. *John* and *Philo* in this matter, that whereas St. *John* affirms, that the Λόγος *was God himſelf, viz.* the moſt High, *Philo* would have it ſaid that the World was created by it, as God's *Inſtrument.* So in Lib. *de Cherubinis*,

p. 100.

Chapter I.

p. 100. after he had ſaid, that there muſt be four things conſidered in every Production, *viz.* the cauſe, the matter, the inſtrument and end for which it is produced, and had applied thoſe things diſtinctly to an Edifice, he adds concerning the World, that: εὑρήσεις ἄπτον μὲν αὐτῆ τὸ Θεὸν, ὑφ' ὃ γέγονεν —— ὄργανον δὲ Λόγον Θεοῦ, δι' ὃ κατεσκευάδη: *you will find that the cauſe of it was God, by whom it was made* —— *and the inſtrument the Reaſon of God, by which it was diſpoſed.* But in St. *John*, *all things* are ſaid *to have been made by Reaſon*, in the ſame manner as if it were ſaid the World was created *by the Divine Power* διὰ τ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ: which words do not ſignify an inſtrument diſtinct from God, but God himſelf. Tho it's true, *Origen* thought it followed from hence, that *Reaſon* was ſomething inferior to God, as we may ſee in his *Comment.* on St. *John*, T. 11. p. 55. *Ed. Huet.* But his reaſoning is vain, as appears by what I ſaid: So St. *Paul* ſays, that he was an Apoſtle διὰ θελήματ Θεοῦ, *by the Will of God*, 1 *Cor.* i. 1. and 2 *Cor.* i. 1. but it cannot be inferred from thence, that the will of God is inferior to God.

That the word πάντα, *all things*, is to be underſtood of the Univerſe, I need not here prove; for tho that word may have ſeveral ſignifications, yet in this matter it cannot be otherwiſe underſtood: They are bad Criticks who conſider what words ſignify ſeparately, and think that any of thoſe ſignifications may be any where applied, without any regard had to the Phraſes in which they occur, or the occaſion on which they are uſed; or who think that an interpretation ought to be admitted, only becauſe it does not make the ſenſe altogether abſurd, and it is not *Metaphyſically*, if I may ſo ſpeak, *impoſſible* but that the Writer, whom they interpret, might mean as they would have him. We ought carefully to conſider, in what ſenſe words are commonly uſed in any Language, with the occaſion of the writing, and all the circumſtances of the Diſcourſe, in order to give a right interpretation of them.

Ibid. *And without it was not any thing made that was made.*] χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. Tho it be a very true Obſervation of a great Man, that the Holy Scriptures do many times explain what they aſſert by a *Negation* of the contrary; yet I do not think that theſe words are added to that end. The Epicureans thought that all and every particular thing was made *without Reaſon*; in contradiction to which the Apoſtle here affirms, that not only *all things*, that is, the Univerſe, but *every ſingle thing* was made with Reaſon. The *Epicureans*, when any objected againſt their opinion the beauty of the World, and the great Benefit which Men received by the Order and Diſpoſition of it, pretended to prove *Nequa-*

Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse paratam
Naturam rerum, tanta stat prædita culpa!

That the World was not made by a divine Power and Wisdom for our use, there are so many faults in it. And they composed a Catalogue of things that were hurtful to Mankind, and seemed to be made without Reason, as we may see in *Lucretius*, Lib. 5. after the words alledged. And so *Cicero* likewise in *Acad. Quæst.* 4. c. 38. disputes thus against the *Stoicks: Cur Deus omnia nostri causâ cum faceret (sic enim vultis) tantum natricum, viperarumque fecerit? cur mortifera tam multa pernicioſa terra, marique disperserit?* &c. *Why God having made all things for our use, as ye affirm, should make so many Watersnakes and Vipers? Why he should disperse so many deadly and pernicious things on the Earth, and in the Sea*, &c. These Arguments had such an effect upon some who were otherwise friends to Providence, that they granted the *Epicureans* there were some things made χωρὶς λόγου *without Reason.* And among these *Philo* was one, to whom I make little doubt but that the Apostle had a respect in this matter also: as he has approved some things in his Doctrine, so he has rejected others, lest by the unwary the bad should be mixed with the good, and lest because he had approved some things, he should seem to have assented to all. That Doctrine of *Philo* was extant in his Book *de Providentia*, out of which we have a long disputation set down in *Eusebius*, *Præp. Evang.* Lib. 8. c. 14. where among other passages we meet with this: Τὰ δ' ἑρπετῶν τὰ ἰοβόλα γίγνει ὑ κατ' εὐσίαν ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐπικλύθησιν, ὡς ἂ τρέπηται εἴπεν. Ζωογονεῖται γὰρ ὑπ' ἐνυπαρχούσης ἡμᾶς μεταβολῆ πρὸς τὸ διαφθορικόν· ὅτια δὲ ἂ σηψις ἐφύζωσεν, ὡς ἱλυβας ἅ, ἢ σὴς τερεδὼν. Φθειρας δ' ἀπὸ τ ἱδρώτων. Ὅσα δ' ἐξ οἰκείας ὕλης κατὰ φύσιν σπερματικὴν, ἂ ἐκπυρωθὲν ἔχῃ γένεσιν εἰκότως ἐπιγέγραπται πρόνοια: *Those creeping things that are poisonous are not made by Providence, but come of course as I before said: For they are generated when the moistneſs that is inherent in them*, or *whereof they consist, becomes warmer than ordinary.* [I think Mr. *le Clere* does not express the sense of this period, when he translates it, *Nascuntur enim cum humiditas terræ inhærens calore mutatur*;] *Some are animated by Putrefaction, as worms in the Belly*, viz. *by the putrefaction of Food, and lice of Sweat. But every thing which is procreated from a seminal and* antecedaneous *Nature* [in the Latin it is *prævisam*, which I take to be a mistake either in Mr. *le Clere*, or in his Printer, for *prægressam*] *out of its proper matter, is justly ascribed to Providence.* This is contrary to the Christian Doctrin, which teaches us that all things were created, and are taken care of by *God*; see *Mat.* x. 29. and Interpreters upon that place.

Chapter I.

Verſ. 4. *In it was Life*] Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. *Life* in this place ſeems to ſignify a clear Doctrin concerning eternal Life, and the way of attaining it, which were but obſcurely known before *Chriſt*; upon which account St. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* i. 20. ſays, that Chriſt *brought Life and Immortality to Light by the Goſpel.* And that this is here St. *John*'s meaning he himſelf ſhews, in 1 *Epiſt.* i. 2. *For the Life*, ſaith he, *was manifeſted, and we have ſeen it and bear witneſs, and declare unto you that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted unto us.* And in the ſame *Epiſt.* Chap. v. 11. *God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son:* Or elſe the λόγος may be called *Life*, becauſe it gives ſpiritual Life to Men in this world, and eternal Life in the other. *Ignatius*, St. *John*'s Diſciple, in his genuin Epiſtle to the Inhabitants of *Smirna*, after he had ſaid that it was difficult for bad Men to repent, ſubjoins; τοῦτο δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς χριστός, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ξῆν: *but this is in the power of Jeſus Chriſt*, (who is) *our true Life.* And in his *Epiſt.* to the *Trallians*, p. 51. *Ed. Voſſ.* ſpeaking of Chriſt, he ſaith; ὃν χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν, *without whom we have no true Life.* There are ſome who think that St. *John* has a reſpect to the Doctrin of the *Gnoſticks*, who affirmed, that *Reaſon* and *Life* were two ſeveral divine Emanations. But whether this, which was afterwards the opinion of *Valentinus*, was before known, is very uncertain: See Note on *Verſ.* 16. Beſides, the ſenſe I have given is plain, and agreeable to what follows.

The Apoſtle ſeems rather to allude here to a Paſſage in *Philo*, who in his Book entitled, *Quis rerum divinarum Hæres*, p. 381. ſaith, Ζωῆς δὲ τριττὸν γένος, τὸ μὲν πρὸς Θεὸν, τὸ δὲ πρὸς γένεσιν, τὸ δὲ μεθόριον μικτὸν ἀμφοῖν· τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς Θεὸν οὐ κατῆλθε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, οὐδὲ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς τοῦ σώματος ἀναγκαίας, &c. *There is a threefold kind of Life, one which is with God, another which is with the Creature, and a third which is of a middle Nature mixed of both: That which is with God has not deſcended to us, or come for the neceſſities of the Body*, &c. But St. *John* teaches us, that *that* kind of Life was brought down upon Earth by Chriſt.

Ibid. *And this Life was the Light of Men.* Ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The *light of the Mind* is a thing very often mentioned by *Philo*; but becauſe he does not fetch that light from the Doctrin of Chriſt, but from Judaiſm, mixed with an opinion of *Plato*, it is all frivolous that he ſays of it. It is only therefore to the Goſpel that that Paſſage of his, concerning the Divine Light, in Lib. *de Humanitate*, p. 551. agrees; καθάπερ γὰρ ἀντιλαμπτὸν ἥλιος τὸ μὲν σκότος ἀταράττεται, φωτὸς ἢ πλησθῆναι τὰ πάντα· ἢ αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅταν θειοτέρας ἥλιος ἀνάσχῃ ψυχὴν, ὁ μὲν ἦθος κακῶν καὶ παθῶν ζόφος ἀναστιδνᾶται, τὸ δὲ αὐγοειδέστατος ἀρετῶν τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ ἀξιλεκτον εἶδος ὑπαίνιται: *For as when the Sun riſes the darkneſs is diſſipated, and all things*

things are filled with Light; ſo when the Sun made by God ariſes and enlightens the Soul, the darkneſs of Vice and Paſſion is diſpelled, and a moſt pure and amiable form [in the Latin it is *ſanctiſſima ſpecies*, but it ſhould have been tranſlated *digna amatu*] *of moſt ſhining Vertue appears.* Chapter I.

Verſ. 5. *Shineth in darkneſs.*] Ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει· *i. e.* is riſen to diſpel Mens ignorance.

Verſ. 7. *Through him might believe*] Πιστεύσωσι δι' αὐτοῦ· *i. e.* that they might by *John*'s Miniſtry be induced to believe in Chriſt. *Grotius*'s interpretation is harſh, *that through the Light they might believe in God.*

Verſ. 8. *He was not the Light*] *viz.* that *excellent* Light of which St. *John* ſpeaks both before and after: For otherwiſe in *Chap.* v. 35. of this Goſpel, *John the Baptiſt* is called *a burning and a ſhining Light.*

Verſ. 9. *That Light was the true Light*] Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν. In *Plato* and his followers, and amongſt the reſt *Philo*, thoſe things are ſaid to be ſuch or ſuch *truly*, which may be ſo called in an excellent ſenſe. Thus in Lib. *de mundi Opificio*, p. 13. *Philo* ſays, that in the harmony of the parts of the World, there is ἀληθὴς μουσική *true Muſick.* And this phraſe St. *John* ſeems to have taken delight in, and frequently makes uſe of, as in 1 *Epiſt.* ii. 8. where he ſays again, *the true Light.* And ſo in this Goſpel *Chap.* vi. 32. Chriſt is called *the true Bread*, and his Fleſh, verſ. 55. *true Meat*, and *Chap.* xv. 1. he is ſaid to be *the true Vine.*

Ibid. *Which came into the World*] Ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. This I refer, as *Grotius* does, to the *Light*, not to *Men.* Conſult his Notes.

Ibid. *Every Man*] Not only the *Jews*, as *John Baptiſt* and the other Prophets did, but all Men of what Nation ſoever they are, of whom vaſt numbers had received the Chriſtian Faith at that time. This is afterwards more clearly explained by St. *John.*

Verſ. 10. *Reaſon was in the World.* I have ſupplied the word *Reaſon*, becauſe the *Pronoun* αὐτὸν preſently follows, which is the Relative to Λόγος. By the *World* here we are to underſtand *men*, amongſt whom *Chriſt* converſed.

Ibid. *And the World was made by it*] *i. e.* eſpecially mankind, whoſe firſt Parents were created by the divine Reaſon.

Ibid. *Knew it not*] *viz.* to be the divine Reaſon, when they ought to have collected from the Diſcourſes and Actions of *Chriſt*, that that ſame Λόγος, by which all things had been created, dwelt in him. He did not bring Laws that were uſeful for one Nation, and hurtful to others, but ſuch as were equally profitable for all mankind, and therefore manifeſtly proceeded from the common Parent of mankind. They were Laws becoming the Creator of all things to make, and fit for all Nations and all Ages; and if the *Jews* had not been blind, *Si mens non*

Chapter I. *lævâ fuiſſet*, as the Poet ſpeaks, they might have eaſily diſcerned their Author.

Verſ. 11. *To its own.*] Τὰ ἴδια, *i. e.* the *Jews*: Conſult *Grotius*. The *Jews* are ſo ſtiled, becauſe they are called *the People of God*, and ſo of the Λόγος.

Ibid. *Received it not.*] For they rejected the Doctrin of *Chriſt*, by whoſe Mouth the divine Reaſon ſpake, and in whom it dwelt.

Verſ. 12. *As many*] *viz.* of what Nation ſoever, becauſe the greateſt part of the *Jews* rejected him.

Ibid. *Received,*] Ἔλαβον, *viz.* as their only Maſter.

Ibid. *It gave them power to become the Sons of God,*] that is, to be called *God's Children* as well as the Jews, and that in a more excellent ſenſe than they. *Moſes*, *Deut.* xxxii. 6. calls God the *Father of the Iſraelites*. In *Pſalm* lxxiii. 15. the ſame People are called *the Generation of God's Children*; and *Hoſ.* i. 10. *the Sons of the living God*. In this Goſpel, *Chap.* viii. 41. they boaſt of their *having one Father, even God*. Now thoſe are called the Sons of God, who worſhip the true God, and living conformably to his Commands, have a well-grounded hope of being made partakers of the good things he has promiſed. And this privilege the *Jews* contended to belong only to themſelves, and thoſe who embraced their Religion, by virtue of the *Moſaical* Covenant. But St. *John* teaches us, that the Divine *Reaſon* has conferred this privilege on all that believe the Goſpel. Perhaps the Apoſtle deſigned alſo in this paſſage to contradict *Philo*, who diſtinguiſhes between the Sons of *God* and the Sons of *Reaſon*, in Lib. *de confuſione Linguarum*, p. 267. Οἱ ὀπτήμιμι, ſaith he, κεχρημένοι τῇ ἐνὸς ἰροῦ Θεοῦ προσηγορείᾳ σιόντως, καλοῦσι καὶ Μωσῆς ὁμολογεῖ φάσκων, "Τἱοὶ ἐστὲ κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ "Θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε. Οὐκ ἄντὸς ὕτὸς σε πατὴρ; ——————Κᾶν μεδέπω πυγχάνῃ τὶς ἀξίωχρεως ὢν ὑὸς Θεοῦ προσαγορεύεδαι, σπεύδαζε κοσμεῖδαι χῶ τὸ πρωτόγονον ἀυτοῦ Λόγον, τὸ ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον· καὶ γὸ εἰ μέπω ἱκανοὶ Θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεδαι γνήσιοι, ἀλλά τι τὸ αἰδέρεικόν ἀυτοῦ Λόγε τὸ ἱερώτατο. Thoſe *that make uſe of knowledg, are deſervedly called the Sons of one God*; as Moſes *alſo acknowledges, ſaying*; Ye are the Sons of the Lord God: *and*, God who hath begotten thee: *and*, is not he himſelf thy Father?——————*If any one be not as yet worthy to be called a Son of God, let him endeavour to be adorned by his firſt-born, Reaſon, the moſt antient Angel: For if we are not yet fit to be reputed the Sons of God, yet* (let us ſtrive to be ſo) *of moſt holy Reaſon, his eternal Image.*

Verſ. 13. *Born not of blood*] As thoſe who were deſcended from *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and thought themſelves to be the Sons of God upon that account: See *Chap.* viii. 33. & *ſeqq.*

Ibid.

Chapter I.

Ibid. *Nor of the will of the flesh.*] Strange women that were taken Captives in war, and married to Jews, were look'd upon to be admitted into the number of God's Children, that is, to be also *Jews*. And of such it is properly said, that they became *Israelites* (or Children of God) *by the will of the flesh*, that is, by fleshly concupiscence: see *Deut.* xxi. 11. & *seqq.*

Ibid. *Of the will of man.*] This has a reference to the Children of Proselites, who upon their Father and his Family's turning Jews, became, if they were little, *the Sons of God* only *by the will of* one *man*. Yea, and an adult Person, who embraced the Jewish Religion, may be said to have become a *Jew* by the *will of man*, viz. his own. It must be carefully observed, that St *John* here uses the word ἀνδρὸς *viri*, and not ἀνθρώπου *hominis*; to distinguish that kind of adoption which was made by the will of a Father, from the former, whereby a strange woman became a Jew *by the will of the flesh*.

Ibid. *But of God*] viz. By Regeneration, or a change of manners, whereby, forsaking Heathenism, and embracing the Gospel, they lived according to the rules of Christianity. Of this Regeneration St. *John* speaks afterwards in *Chap.* iii. 3. & *seqq.* And St. *Paul* insists upon it very much, in his *Epistle* to the *Romans* and elsewhere; for to this all that he says almost about the υἱοθεσία, or *adoption* of the Gentiles, has a respect. Which my design in this place will not permit me at large to shew.

Vers. 14. *Was made flesh.*] Σὰρξ ἐγένετο. That by *flesh* we are to understand *human nature*, is generally observed by Interpreters, who may be consulted. But the Λόγος may be said to have been *made flesh*, or *man*, in more respects than one; and here it is said to have been *made flesh*, in regard that, being clothed, as it were, with the Flesh of Christ, it became conspicuous; for *Flesh* sometimes signifies a conspicuous nature in opposition to one that is spiritual or inconspicuous. So it is used by St. *Paul* in 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. where he tells us that God *appeared in Flesh*, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, was *justified in Spirit*, &c. *i. e.* God became, as it were, conspicuous, when all *the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily* in Christ; in *Christ*, I say, who being a Man, was conspicuous and visible, and in whom God shewed himself to be present. I know other Copies have ἀνθρώπων, but the sense is the same. That the word *Flesh* is taken here for human Nature, as conspicuous, appears by the following words in this, and by the 18*th* verse. Tho when I say that *Flesh* is considered here by St. *John* as *conspicuous*, or precisely under that notion, that is so far from excluding the other *properties*, as the Schoolmen speak, of human nature, that on the contrary it *supposes*

Chapter I. poſes them. For our Fleſh is therefore conſpicuous, becauſe it is a neceſſary property of human nature to be conſpicuous.

It is rightly ſaid by Divines, that *Reaſon was made Fleſh*, not by a converſion of the divine Nature into a human, which is as impoſſible as for a human to be changed into a divine; but by an unexpreſſible *indwelling* of God, whereby the humanity of *Chriſt* became the humanity of *God*, in a ſingular and extraordinary manner; as on the other hand the *divine* Reaſon was made the Divinity of *Chriſt*, by that ſecret union. From that time *God* might be called *Fleſh*, and reciprocally the name of *God* might be attributed to *Fleſh* or *Man*. And upon the account of this conjunction of two Natures in *Chriſt*, the Apoſtles ſpeak of him ſometimes as *God*, ſometimes as a *Man*; and do not only aſcribe to Chriſt, what they had ſeen done by the *man Jeſus*, but alſo what the divine Reaſon did before *Jeſus* was born: ſee *Col.* i. 14. & *ſeqq.* & *Heb.* i. 2, 10.

Ibid. *Dwelt among us.*] Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. That is, it dwelt in a man who converſed among us. All theſe things *Philo* was ignorant of, or elſe reſolved to be ſo, if it be true what ſome of the Antients ſay, that having embraced the Chriſtian Religion, he afterwards apoſtatized from it: ſee *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Lib. 2. c. 17. & *Photius* Cod. 105.

Ibid. *We beheld its Glory*] *i. e.* ſuch Miracles as were never before, or in the ſame manner done by any. That Miracles are called the *Glory* of God, I have ſhewn in my Notes on *Exod.* xvi. 7. Amongſt thoſe Miracles which were wrought for the honour of *Chriſt*, a very eminent one was that of his Transfiguration, ſpoken of by St. *Peter* in his 2 *Epiſt.* i. 16, 17. whoſe words give great light to this paſſage: *For we have not followed*, ſaith he, *cunningly deviſed Fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; but were eye witneſſes of his Majeſty. For he received from God the Father, honour* and glory, [δόξαν] *when there came ſuch a voice to him from the magnificent Glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleaſed:* ſee *Mat.* xvii.

Ibid. *As of the only begotten*] whom he accordingly gave that glory to, which he had never before conferred on any, or ever will. The Prophets who were Brethren, and the Sons of God in the ſame manner as one another, had often an equal glory put upon them by the Miracles which God wrought at their requeſt. But the Miracles of *Jeſus Chriſt* were ſo many and great, that they were capable, if I may ſo ſpeak, of obſcuring all that had been formerly wrought by their multitude and ſplendor.

By

By this word *only begotten* perhaps St. *John* might have a ſecret deſign to oppoſe the Doctrin of *Philo*, who generally calls the Λογον not μονογενῆ *the only begotten*, but only πρωτόγονον the firſt begotten, and πρεσβύτατον *the moſt antient of the Angels*. *Grotius* thinks that the *Gnoſticks* are here condemned, who made the Λόγον & Μονογενῆ to be two different perſons; but it is uncertain whether thoſe frivolous *Syzigiæ Pleromatis* had been invented when St. *John* wrote: ſee on *verſ.* 16. Chapter I.

Ibid. *Of* or *from the Father*] Παρὰ πατρός. This muſt be referred to the word *Glory*: ſee *Grotius*.

Ibid. *Full of Grace and Truth*,] Πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. If theſe words be referred to the immediatly foregoing, we muſt ſupply ὃς ἦν *who was*, viz. the only begotten. Otherwiſe they muſt be included in a Parentheſis, as I have done them. *Grotius* however is of another opinion, who may be conſulted.

Grace and Truth] that is, in Hebrew חסד ואמת *hheſed vecmeth*, of which phraſe I have diſcourſed in my Notes on *Gen.* xxiv. 27. There is an oppoſition made here between the Goſpel and the Law, as appears from the 17*th* verſe. The Moſaical Law appointed Sacrifices for the expiation of ſome ſort of Sins; which if they were wilfully and knowingly neglected, tho it were but once, it denounced death upon the Sinner, whatever his Repentance was afterwards. For other ſins there were no expiatory Sacrifices inſtituted, but they were to be puniſhed with death. Neither did God by virtue of that Covenant promiſe to any one that died for tranſgreſſing the Law, tho never ſo penitent, any mercy in the life to come. And yet theſe were Sins, which by reaſon of the multitude of the Laws were frequently committed; ſo that God diſcovered nothing but his inflexible Juſtice in the Law. It's true, he promiſes Forgiveneſs to the whole Jewiſh Nation, becoming penitent after the deſtruction of their Commonwealth, in *Levit.* xxvi. and elſewhere. But particular Perſons, as long as the Commonwealth ſtood ſinning in that manner as I have ſaid, had no hopes of pardon. But it is quite otherwiſe under the Goſpel, in which God promiſes pardon to the greateſt Sinner, upon repentance and amendment of life, and that without the intervention of Sacrifices. And in this ſenſe the Goſpel alone is full of the *grace and mercy* of God.

Verſ. 15. *John bare witneſs*] or *bears witneſs*, μαρτυρεῖ, *viz.* in the Goſpels. But I have preferred the former, becauſe it follows (in the Preterperfect tenſe) κέκραγε *he cried*. It is thought by ſome, that this is repeated by the *Evangeliſt*, becauſe there were ſome who choſe to be the Diſciples of *John* the *Baptiſt* rather than of *Chriſt*, and ſo gave the

preſe-

Chapter I. *preference* to *him.* And when the Goſpel was firſt preached, it is certain there were ſuch perſons, as appears by *John*'s having Diſciples of his own that went under his name, and from *Acts* xix. But that ſo many years after Chriſt's aſcenſion into Heaven, there remained any ſuch perſons, is not probable; and the words of the *Evangeliſt* may reſpect any of the *Jews* whatſoever, who having a good opinion of *John* the *Baptiſt*, becauſe he was of a Sacerdotal Order, and uncondemned by the Sanhedrim, did yet reject *Chriſt*, becauſe he was condemned unjuſtly, and did not know that *John* the *Baptiſt* had given a moſt clear teſtimony of him.

Ibid. *That is to come*] *viz.* In the Name of God to his People.

Ibid. *Was before me.*] That is, in dignity, or a more eminent Perſon than I: ſee *Grotius.* And to the paſſages alledged by that great Man to this purpoſe, add this out of *Euripides*, in *Oreſte* ver. 488. where it is ſaid to be the Character of a Greek:

Καὶ τ' νόμων γε μὴ πρέπειν εἶναι δίκεν:

Not to deſire to be above the Laws, or *ſuperior to the Laws*, ὑπερέχειν, as the *Scholiaſt* well explains it.

Verſ. 16. *Of his fulneſs*] Ἐκ τ πληρώμα]. *Irenæus* ſuppoſes this to have a reference to the πλήρωμα, which he attributes not only to the *Valentinians*, but to *Cerinthus*, and ſuch as were antienter than he, the *Nicolaitans*, Lib. 3. c. 11. But I cannot perfectly agree with him for the following reaſons.

1. He himſelf in *Lib.* 1. *c.* 25 & 27. where he ſets down the Doctrin of *Cerinthus* and the *Nicolaitans*, has nothing about this *Pleroma*, which he affirms to have been peculiar to the *Valentinians* in *Chap.* 1. of the ſame Book.

2. Theſe words do not confute thoſe who invented that term, for all whom it might be ſaid, that men do receive Grace from the *fulneſs* that is in *Reaſon*: ſee *Irenæus* himſelf, *Cap.* 1. *lib.* 1.

3. *Irenæus* might eaſily confound the Doctrins of various Hereticks, as he did the Fooleries of the *Millenaries*, with the Doctrin of the Apoſtle *John.* He was a very pious man, and a great lover of the Chriſtian Religion, the truth of which he ſealed with his Blood; but that he was any great Judg of things or opinions, will not be thought by any who ſhall but carefully read his Writings. It were to be wiſhed alſo, that he had rather left us inſtances of his Charity to the Heterodox, than of his Zeal, which is often ſo like Anger, that it can hardly be diſtinguiſhed from it. I am ſure the innumerable dotages of thoſe men

men deſerved rather pity than anger. In fine, it is highly probable that the word πλήρωμα came into St. *John*'s mind, and was therefore uſed by him, becauſe he had ſaid juſt before, that Chriſt had appeared πλήρης χάριτος; and he uſed it the rather, becauſe he knew that St. *Paul* had made uſe of it in a like ſenſe in his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, Chap. ii. 9. and elſewhere. Now πλήρωμα here ſignifies the *fulneſs of the Godhead*, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, which *dwells in Chriſt*; that is, the *divine Reaſon* it ſelf, from whence iſſued the Goſpel, which is often called χάρις by St. *Paul*. Chapter I.

Ibid. *Grace for Grace.*] χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. Theſe words have ſtrangely perplexed Interpreters, whoſe conjectures I ſhall not here ſet down. They have been collected by *J. C. Suicerus* in *Theſauro*, on the word χάρις; I ſhall only propoſe my own. The χάρις which we have received from God is, as I before ſaid, the Goſpel it ſelf, and all the benefits of it, which he beſtows upon us ἀντὶ χάριτος, that is, *gratis*, and with a *proviſo* only that we are thankful to him; which comprehends all the duty of a Chriſtian, becauſe we cannot heartily ἀντιχαρίζεσθαι θεῷ *return thanks to God* unleſs we alſo obey his Goſpel. For when God promiſes us eternal life, if we believe on Chriſt, and renounce our former ſins, and amend our lives; How can we be ſaid to be thankful to him, if we do not ſo ſmall a thing for that great benefit? God therefore in this ſenſe may be ſaid to give us χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. When I interpret χάριν by *thankfulneſs*, or *a thankful diſpoſition of mind*, I go according to the common uſe of that word among the Greeks, with whom χάριν ἔχειν or εἰδέναι is an ordinary phraſe. So alſo it is taken by St. *Paul* in *Rom.* vi. 17. χάρις τῷ θεῷ, *thanks be to God*. See likewiſe 1 *Cor.* xv. 57. & 2 *Cor.* viii. 16. And there is a ſort of an elegance in repeating the ſame word in a different ſenſe, of which ſee *Grotius*. As for the Prepoſition ἀντὶ, I take that alſo in its proper and moſt uſual ſenſe, whereby it ſignifies a permutation, as in theſe words which others have cited out of *Euripides*'s *Helena*, χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω, *let benefit come for benefit*, V. 1250. Not to depart from the words before us, or to be laborious in the proof of what is plain, it ſhall ſuffice to obſerve that the Greeks call a benefit, which is return'd for a benefit received, ἀντιχάρις, and thence deduce the Verb ἀντιχαρίζεσθαι *to return*, or *repay a benefit*: So that that paſſage of *Euripides* would be almoſt perfectly parallel to this in St. *John*, if we could but demonſtrate our thankfulneſs to God in the ſame manner as we can to men. Which being unable to do, we expreſs our gratitude to him by our words and faithful obedience. *Summus rerum inviſibilium procreator*, to uſe the words of *Arnobius*, *dignus eſt verè, ſi modo eum*

Chapter II. *dignum mortali dicendum est ore, qui spirans omnis intelligensque natura, & habere & agere nunquam desinat gratias. The great Creator of things invisible is worthy, is truly worthy, if mortal lips are not too mean to say that he is worthy, to be incessantly praised and thanked by every living and intelligent nature.* This is our ἀντιχαεις which we give to God. *What shall I render unto the Lord?* saith the Psalmist in *Psalm* cxvi. 12. *All his benefits are above me: I will take the cup of Salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord.*

Vers. 17. *The Law was given by* Moses.] Νόμος is often in St. *Paul*, as it is here, opposed to χάρις *the Law of Grace*, which I have observed on *vers.* 14.

Vers. 18. *No man hath seen God at any time*] That is, before the revelation of his Son, no body ever understood the will of God; for sometimes we are said *to see* those things which we have an exact knowledg of: See *Grotius*.

Ibid. *Which is in the bosom of the Father*] That is, most dear to God, as the same learned Interpreter has shewn.

Ibid. *Was his Interpreter.*] Ἐξηγήσατο, *viz.* God, *i. e.* his Will: See *Mat.* xi. 27. and Expositors on that place.

Vers. 46. Οὐ γέγραπται——ἰωτὰ καὶ μία] For ἰωτὰ καὶ μία οὐ γέγραπται. Of the like misplacing of words, see Examples in *Chap.* x. 36. & xvii. 3.

CHAP. II.

Vers. 4. *Note* a. THere are two things which I would have here further observed for the understanding of *Mary*'s Petition, and *Christ*'s answer. *One* is, that the words *they have no Wine*, are the expression of *Mary*'s request to her Son to supply that defect, as appears by the answer which *Christ* made her. But how was it that she would have him do that? Undoubtedly not by purchasing Wine with *Money*, with which she knew *Christ* did not abound; but, as Interpreters generally suppose, by working a *Miracle*, and supplying the new married couple with *Wine*, in the same manner as *Elijah* of old had supplied the widow of *Sarepta* with *Oil*. And hence it may be probably inferred that *Christ* had done some other Miracles before this time: For how could his Mother have desired him to work a Miracle, if she had never seen him do any before? She knew indeed by the revelation of the Angel, that her Son was the *Messias*; but she could not from thence conclude that he would work Miracles, especially such a one as that, when she pleased to desire it. And therefore

whe

when it is said at *verſ.* 11. that *this beginning of Miracles did Jeſus*, &c. we muſt underſtand the Evangeliſt to ſpeak of ſuch Miracles as were done *publickly*.

Secondly, I would have it obſerved, that the anſwer which *Chriſt* here gave to his Mother, contains nothing in it whereby ſhe might conclude his purpoſe to comply with her Requeſt; nay that on the contrary he ſeems to have rejected her Petition. And therefore it may be matter of enquiry, whence ſhe gathered that he intended to fulfil it; and doubtleſs it muſt be from ſome other words of his, which perhaps St. *John* not having heard, has omitted; or ſome ſign he afterwards gave her to aſſure her of it, tho her Requeſt was at that time unſeaſonable.

Verſ. 6. Δύο ἢ τρεῖς.] *It is the part of a conſcientious Witneſs*, ſaith a great Man, *to affirm nothing too peremptorily or particularly*. But St. *John* had not been the leſs conſcientious a Witneſs, if he had *determinately* ſaid either Δύο or τρεῖς, for there is no ſuch exactneſs requiſite in ſuch matters as theſe; and the reaſon of his ſpeaking as he did, was, becauſe he did not juſtly know the ſize of the Waterpots. Nothing is more ordinary than this way of ſpeaking in common diſcourſe.

Verſ. 9. Φωνεῖ.] This word in the *Vulgar*, and other Interpreters, is rendered by *vocat*, *called*, which is properly the ſignification of καλεῖ; but it ought rather to have been rendered by *compellat*, *ſpake to* him, φωνεῖ here ſignifying the ſame as προσφωνεῖ; for the tranſlating it by *vocare*, *calling*, ſeems to imply that the Bridegroom was not at that time preſent with the company, but came when the Governour of the Feaſt called him, which is not at all likely.

Verſ. 11. Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων,] *viz.* which he did *publickly*: See Note on *verſ.* 3.

Verſ. 18. Τί σημεῖον] The reaſon of their queſtioning Chriſt thus, was becauſe none might alter any thing that was done in the Temple, unleſs he had either a Commiſſion from the *Sanhedrim*, or Prophetical Authority; and that *Chriſt* had no Commiſſion for doing what he did from the *Sanhedrim*, they were very well ſatisfied, and therefore they preſently ask him how he proved himſelf to be a Prophet, ſince he acted in that quality. This our Author ought to have expreſſed more diſtinctly than he has, in his Paraphraſe; in which he often elſewhere hooks in leſs neceſſary Remarks.

Verſ. 23. Ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.] This might be expreſſed in Hebrew by ויאמינו לשמו, *i. e.* they did not only *believe him*, but they believed him alſo to be the Perſon that he was *called*, or that the *name* of a Prophet or *Meſſias* was truly attributed to him.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 5. *Note* a. THE παλιγγενεσία or *regeneration* ſpoken of in *Matt.* xix. 28. has no relation at all to *Baptiſm.* See my Notes on that place.

Verſ 19. Ἡ γὰρ πονηρὰ ἀνηῤ τὰ ἔργα.] The proofs of the Divinity of the Goſpel are ſuch, that as perſpicuous as they are, they are only ſo to thoſe that are of a teachable temper and diſpoſition, and not blinded by their luſts. The holineſs of *Chriſts* Commands, notwithſtanding their agreableneſs with human nature, and the intereſt of men, diſpleaſes thoſe who are obſtinately addicted to the contrary Vices; who do not fall into Sin through ignorance or infirmity, but knowingly and wilfully ſerve their wicked inclinations, and would not be reſcued from that ſlavery or bondage. Such men as theſe do not deſire to have their evil deeds *enlightened* by the Goſpel, and ſo made manifeſt to every one. But on the other hand, thoſe that for the moſt part lived agreably to Nature, and were miſled only by ignorance or infirmity, were mightily refreſhed and pleaſed with the light of the Goſpel, and moſt readily entertained it, either becauſe it was agreable to thoſe true notions that they had before, or delivered them from that ignorance and impotency which they would gladly have been freed from if there had been any light to convince them of the Truth, or confirm them in it. See *Chap.* vii. 17. This ſubject is excellently and eloquently proſecuted by *Lactantius Inſtit. Divin.* Lib. 7. c. 1. out of whom I ſhall tranſcribe one or two paſſages. *Hæc noſtra,* ſaith he there, *quæ tradimus, pravæ vitioſæque mentes aut omnino non intelligent (hebetatur enim acies eorum terrenis cupiditatibus, quæ ſenſus omnes gravant, imbecilleſque reddunt) aut etiamſi intelligent, diſſimulabunt tamen, & hæc vera eſſe nolent, quia trahuntur à vitiis & ſcientes malis ſuis favent, quorum ſuavitate capiuntur; & virtutis viam deſeruntur, cujus acerbitate offenduntur. Nam qui avaritia & opum inexplebili quadam ſiti flagrant, quia non poſſunt venditis aut dilargitis, quæ amant, tenui cultu vitam degere; ſine dubio malunt id eſſe fictum, quo deſideriis ſuis renuntiare coguntur. Theſe things which I have ſaid, vitious and depraved minds will either not underſtand at all (their apprehenſions being darkned with earthly deſires, which weaken and ſtupify all the ſenſes) or if they underſtand them, they will make nevertheleſs as if they did not, and be unwilling that theſe things ſhould be true, becauſe they are overpowered and hurried away by their luſts, and knowingly indulge their evil practices, with the ſweetneſs of which they are captivated; and forſake the paths of virtue, the ruggedneſs whereof*

offends

offends them. *For those who are inflamed with a covetous and insatiable desire after riches, because they cannot sell or give away those things which they love, and be content to live upon a little, will doubtless be willing to believe that false, which would oblige them to renounce their sinful desires.* And having instanced in some other sorts of persons, he proceeds thus, *Ii sunt homines, qui contra veritatem, clausis oculis, quoquo modo latrant. Qui autem sani erunt, id est, non ita vitiis immersi, ut insanabiles sint; & credent his & libenter accedent; & quæcunque dicimus aperta, plana, simplicia, & quod maxime opus est, vera & inexpugnabilia illis videbuntur. Nemo virtuti favet nisi qui sequi potest, sequi autem non est facile omnibus,* &c. *These are the men that shut their eyes against the truth, and do all they can to oppose it. But all unprejudiced persons, that is, such as are not incurably vitious, will easily assent to these things, and readily entertain them; and whatever we say will seem plain and natural to them, and as it is especially requisite they should, true and impossible to be confuted. No man favours the side of virtue but he that has the heart to practise it, and the practice of virtue is not easy to all,* &c. Chapter IV.

Vers. 21 Ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν] This is not properly to be understood of one *that acts sincerely*, as *Grotius* speaks, that is, whose vertue is not counterfeited, but of an honest or good man. The Hebrew אמת *truth* is taken for *righteousness* and *goodness* in 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 1. and so the Greek ἀλήθεια is used in *Eph.* v. 9. And the opposition that is here made between these persons and πάντας τοὺς φαῦλα πράσσοντας, not particularly *Hypocrites*, confirms this Interpretation.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 1. Ως ἔγνω ὁ κύριος] viz. *by his divine knowledg*, saith *Grotius*. But there is no reason to suppose but he might know it too by the report of others, since it is not secret thoughts that are here spoken of.

Vers. 5. Συχάρ] S. *Jerom* it seems read it in his Copies, or at least thought that it ought to be read *Sichem*; for in his Epitaph on *Paula* he has these words: *Transivit* Sichem, *non ut plerique errantes legunt* Sichar, *quæ nunc Neapolis appellatur, & ex latere montis Garizim exstructam, circa puteum Jacob, intravit Ecclesiam; super quo residens Dominus, sitiensq; & esuriens Samaritanæ fide satiatus est. She passed through* Sichem, *not* Sichar, *as most erroneously read it, which is now called Neapolis, and entered into the Church that was built on the side of the mountain Garizim, near Jacobs Well, on which our Saviour sat, and satisfied his hungry and thirst with the faith of the Samaritan Woman.* But all our Copies and

Chapter IV. and the Antient Interpreters agree, and possibly *Sichar* and *Sichem* might be two different Towns, as *Eusebius* thought, who in *locis Hebr.* speaks thus: Συχαρ, ἀπὸ μιᾶς πόλεως πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου, ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακὼβ Ἰωσὴφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην τῇ Σαμαρείτιδι ὁμιλήκατα, ἐν ᾧπερ νῦν διήκονται: which words are thus rendered by S. *Jerom*: *Sychar ante Neapolin, juxta agrum, quem dedit Jacob filio tuo Joseph, in quo Dominus noster atque salvator, secundum Evangelium Johannis, Samaritanæ mulieri ad puteum loquitur, ubi nunc Ecclesia fabricata est.* *Sychar before Neapolis, near the field which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, in which our Lord and Saviour, as St.* John *tells us in his Gospel, discoursed with the Samaritan woman,* sitting *upon a Well, where there is a Church now built.* Yet *Grotius* and other learned men confound these two Cities. And doubtless they were near to one another.

Vers. 20. Ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ] Dr. *Hammond* understands this of the mountains of *Shiloh*, which are twelve miles distant from that of *Garizim*, as S. *Jerom* affirms. But *Grotius* and others more truly think that we are to understand it of the mountain *Garizim* it self, because the discourse is concerning a mountain in which *God* was at that time publickly worshipped by the *Samaritans*.

Vers. 34. Ἐμὸν βρῶμα] The Apostles discourse gave *Christ* an occasion to make use of this Metaphor; by which he intended to shew that the bringing of men to repentance was that which he was most intent upon, and could for sometime also neglect eating and drinking for. There is such another metaphor in *Plautus*, *Cistellar.* Act. 4. Sc. 2. v. 54. where a Servant, to shew that he was attentive to what a Woman said, is represented speaking in this manner:

Istuc ago, atque istuc mihi cibus est, quod fabulare;

i. e. *I should not eat more heartily when I am hungry, than I now listen to what you say.* So likewise *edere sermonem* is another phrase made use of by that *Comedian* in *Aulular.* Act. 3. Sc. 6. v. 1. See *Taubmannus* upon the place.

Vers. 42. Ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου] i. e. he that is come to save or deliver *us*. By the *World* here is meant only the *Circumcised*, for it is not likely that the Samaritans had any thoughts about the salvation of the Gentiles, which the Apostles themselves knew for a long while nothing of. Compare *Chap.* vii. 4. with xii. 19. where the word κόσμος signifies only the *Jews*. And so in our modern languages, and particularly in the French, the Phrase *tout le monde*, is taken sometimes more strictly, and sometimes more comprehensively.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 2. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ] Either the Verb ἐστὶ here muſt be underſtood to ſignify the time paſt, or elſe inſtead of it we muſt, as ſome Copies do, read it ἦν *was*; for St. *John*, as the Antients unanimouſly teſtify, wrote a great many years after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. See my *Animadverſions* on the beginning of this Goſpel.

Verſ. 31. Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ ἐμαυτῷ, &c. i. e. If I only affirmed my ſelf to be ſent from *God*, and did not prove my ſelf to be ſo, you might juſtly reject my teſtimony. For he that ſays he is a Prophet, and does nothing at all to confirm ſuch an aſſertion, is certainly no Prophet, becauſe *God* does not leave his Prophets without any teſtimony from *himſelf* that they are ſo. This argument quite overthrows the pretence of *Mahomet*. See *Chap.* viii. 16.

Verſ. 32. Οἶδα] The *Cambridg Copy* reads οἴδατε, and ſome others οἴδαμεν. The former indeed ſeems proper, but the *Copy* is ſuſpected. And beſides, the latter is oftner uſed by St. *John*. See *Chap.* xxi. 24. I ſhould render it in French by *on ſait*, *tis known*, for it is put for the *Indefinite* οἴδαμεν.

Ver. 38. Οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα] i. e. Ye have heard and read indeed his word, but it has not entered into your hearts, ſo as to be a perpetual rule of life always in your view, and never to be forgotten by you. When we deſpiſe any thing that another ſays, the remembrance of it ſeldom *abides* with us long; but what we are affected with, *manet*, as the Poet ſays, *alta mente repoſtum*, *abides deeply fixed in our mind*, and upon the next fit occaſion it breaks out. This is the importance of the Verb μένειν here, and we meet with it in the ſame ſenſe ſeveral times in the 2*d* Chap. of the 1*ſt* Epiſt. of St. *John*, and in the 2*d* Epiſt. and 2*d verſe*.

Verſ. 39. Ἐραυνᾶτε] This verb I rather take to be in the *Indicative* than in the *Imperative* mood, and interpret the words of Chriſt to this ſenſe: "You are generally very curious in ſearching into the abſtruſe meaning of the Scriptures, becauſe ye think, and that juſtly, that ye ſhall derive thoſe inſtructions from thence which will lead you to eternal Life; and theſe give their Teſtimony to me which ye do not hearken to, becauſe ye ſuffer your ſelves to be prejudiced by perverſe Affections. It is very probably conjectured by a Learned Man, that the ἔρευνα, or *ſearching*, here ſpoken of, does not refer to the Grammatical, but the Myſtical ſenſe of the Scriptures. It is certain that the *Jews* at that time neglected the ſtudy

Chapter VI.

ſtudy of Grammar, and therefore thoſe Scripture paſſages which concerned the *Meſſias*, do not ſeem to have been underſtood by them by the aſſiſtance of that Art, but by the inſtructions of the antient Prophets: See *Bruno Diſſert. de Therapeutis.* Perhaps *Chriſt* uſed the word דרש, which at that time did not ſignify ſimply to *inquire*, but to *ſearch into* the Allegorical meaning of any Paſſage: Conſult *Buxtorf in Theſauro*, if you doubt of it.

Verſ. 46. Εἰς ὃν ἐπιστεύετε.] *i. e.* "By whoſe Doctrin which ye profeſs to believe, ye think ye can attain to Salvation; for *Chriſt* here ſpeaks of what will be at the day of Judgment. I do not believe theſe words are to be underſtood of *Moſes* making *interceſſion* for the *Jews*, tho I know what is alledged by a great Man in favour of that opinion, out of the *Rabbins*. The ſenſe will be moſt commodious, if we underſtand it to be that thoſe who imagined themſelves to act conſonantly to the Law in rejecting *Chriſt*, ſhall be condemned hereafter by the Law it ſelf, according to which they were certainly obliged to receive him. See *Deut.* xviii. 15.

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 15. *Note* a. CHRIST avoided the Multitude who took counſel together about making him a King, not only becauſe this was a bad deſign, and proceeded from Perſons of wicked and carnal Minds; but alſo becauſe he would not give the leaſt occaſion for a Sedition, and that his enemies might never be able to accuſe him with any appearance of Juſtice, of having affected to be an earthly Prince. If he had tarried among theſe Men, tho he had oppoſed them, and openly rebuked them, and hindred them from executing their deſigns; yet their very *attempt* alone would have cauſed ſuſpicious Men to conceive ſuch a bad opinion of the Goſpel (which was then but in its infancy) as it would have been very hard to diſpoſſeſs them of. *Chriſt's* enemies would have ſaid that he had plotted a change in the Government, and that he was not ſo much diſpleaſed with his followers for their deſire to deliver the Kingdom into his hands, as for their unſeaſonable reſolution to make him their King, before he had brought his Conſpiracy to a head, and encreaſed the number of his Followers: They would have ſaid that it was dangerous to ſuffer ſuch a Teacher to live amongſt the *Jews*, who might even without his knowledg and conſent, give the common People an occaſion to take up arms againſt the State. It is well known how miſtruſtful and cautious thoſe to whom the government

of

of the World belonged at that time, were in ſuch matters; and when I do but mention the name of *Tiberius*, every one will preſently apprehend that it was a moſt dangerous thing then, ſo much as unwillingly to be the cauſe of a Sedition. This ſeems to be the reaſon why *Chriſt* would not have it divulged that he was the *Meſſias*, *viz.* leſt the very mention of that name ſhould, like the ſetting up of a Flag, occaſion a great confluence of People to him. See Note on *Mat.* viii. 4. Chapter VI.

Verſ. 27. *Note* b. Ἐργάζεσθαι βρῶσιν, to ſpeak properly, is neither *operari cibum*, as it is rendred in the *Vulgar*, nor *acquirere cibum*, *to acquire Food*, as by our Author; but *laborare ut acquiras*, *to acquire it by Labor*. And ſo the Greeks ſay likewiſe, ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια & ἐργάζεσθαι βίον, for *neceſſaria* or *victum labore ſuo lucrari*, *to earn neceſſaries* or *a livelihood by ones Labor*, or as the French call it *gagner ſa vie*, *to get ones living*: See only *Conſtantin's Lexicon*. So in the example brought out of *Palæphatus*, εἰργάσατο βρῶμα ſignifies *he got his living by his Labour*. In the example of the *Pounds*, Luk. xix. 16. the word περιεργάσατο ſignifies rather *peperit*, *genuit*, *it hath produced* or *brought forth*, than *comparavit it hath acquired*.

Verſ. 44. Ἐὰν μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἑλκύσῃ αὐτὸν] *i. e.* unleſs they have been already ſo affected with God's *former* benefits, as to be ready to follow *God* whitherſoever he leads them, which will make them come to me aſſoon as ever they hear my Doctrin. I like what is ſaid by *Fauſtus Regienſis*, Lib. 1. c. 17. de Lib. Arbitrio. *Quid eſt*, ſays he, *attrahere niſi prædicare, niſi Scripturarum conſolationibus excitare, increpationibus deterrere, deſideranda proponere, intentare metuenda, judicium comminari, præmium polliceri? Audi Dominum non duris manibus, ſed ſpei nexibus attrahentem, & dilectionis brachiis invitantem, ſicut ait Propheta*, attraxi eos vinculis caritatis, Hoſ. xi. 4. *What is it to draw, but to preach, but to encourage People by the conſolations of the Scriptures, and deter them by its Reproofs, to propoſe to Men ſuch things as they ſhould deſire, and menace them with what they ought to fear, to threaten them with Puniſhments, and promiſe them Rewards? Hearken therefore to God who draws not with rough hands, but with the ties of Hope, and invites with the arms of Love, according to that of the Prophet*, I drew them with the bands of Love.

Verſ. 55. *Note* f. For the underſtanding of what the word ἀληθὴς ſignifies, when it is thus metaphorically uſed, we muſt conſider whence ſuch forms of Speech had their riſe; which in all probability was from the cuſtom of Merchants who uſed to diſtinguiſh *true merchandizes* from *falſe*, i. e. thoſe to which the name they went by was *truly* attributed, (the received Cuſtom determining that) from thoſe to which it cannot be given but *falſly*: thus *true Amomum*, for inſtance,

Chapter VII.

ſtance, will be that Plant to which this name is properly attributed; and *falſe Amomum* another on which it is abuſively impoſed. And becauſe any ſort of Plant which is truly called by the name it bears, has a much greater Virtue in it than a Plant falſly denominated, therefore *true Amomum* was preferred before *falſe*. And for the ſame reaſon, when any two things are compared together, which are endued with a like quality, tho in a different degree; that which has the ſtrongeſt and beſt, and which is of moſt uſe, is ſaid to be *true*, and the other compared with it, *falſe*. So the Platonicks uſed to call *the divine Patterns of all things*, as they expreſſed themſelves, *true*, when they compared them with the things upon Earth, which are only their Pictures, according to them. And whatever Virtue there is in things viſible, it could be no otherwiſe compared they thought with the Celeſtial, than as counterfeit things with thoſe that are ſincere and genuin: and therefore they called theſe *falſe*, and the other *true*. And juſt thus *Chriſt* in this place is ſaid to be *the true Bread, and the true Meat*, and elſewhere *the true Light*, *viz.* becauſe whatever propriety there is in Bread or Meat to nouriſh the Body, or in Light to illuminate the Eyes, that and a much greater there is in *Chriſt*'s Doctrin to nouriſh and enlighten the Mind. Bread nouriſhes the Body, but does not exempt it from Death, which corrupts and diſſolves at length its frame; but the Doctrin of *Chriſt*, whilſt it nouriſhes the Soul with Hope, and excites and cheriſhes in it the love of Vertue, does not only fill it with ſolid and ſubſtantial joy at preſent, but alſo reſcues it from dying for ever. Light illuminates the Eye, and ſhews it viſible Objects when it is rightly diſpoſed in their proper forms; but it neither cures the diſtempers of the Eyes, nor can hinder them from being cloſed at laſt by Death: but the Doctrin of Chriſt makes blind Souls to ſee clearly, and enlightens them for ever; ſo that in this ſenſe it is moſt truly called both *the true Meat* and *the true Light*.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 35. *Note* d. I. IT is true indeed that there was a vaſt number of Jews at *Alexandria*, who uſed the Tranſlation of the *Septuagint*, as appears by many paſſages in *Philo Alexandr.* See *Lib.* againſt *Flaccus*. But that the European Jews had their *chief Aſſembly* at *Alexandria*, I cannot tell how our Author could have proved, unleſs he thought *Alexandria* to be in *Europe*, which would have been a ſtrange miſtake. It's true, ſome of the old *Geographers*

graphers place it in *Asia*, and others in *Africa*; but none of them ever said that it was in *Europe*, which is too absurd. II. He ought also to have proved, that the *Onkelos* was at that time read in the Synagogues of the *Jews* at *Babylon*; for it is not safe to rely upon the Authority of the *Rabbins*, who are always for putting as great a face of Antiquity upon their Writings as they are able. Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 53. *Note* i. It is ſtrange that Dr. *Hammond*, after giving ſufficient proofs of this ſtory of the Adultereſs being ſuppoſititious, and ſaying nothing almoſt on the other ſide to confirm its being thought genuin, ſhould yet aſſent to *Grotius* who has not in the leaſt ſolv'd the matter. If the Church in the time of *Papias*, or in the next Age after him, judged this Tradition of his to be true; how comes it to paſs that ſo many Fathers and ſo many Copies a great while after thoſe times omitted this Story? It is much more probable that it was added at firſt only to a few Copies by ſome *Tranſcribers* or *Criticks*, who took it from the Tradition or Copy of the *Nazarens*, and in time came to be inſerted by that means into more; nor is there any footſtep any where to be found, of the judgment of the Antient Church concerning this Story: So that I think we ought rather to be of *Beza*'s opinion, who ſuſpects this Story; at leaſt what he ſays as to this matter, is worth conſidering.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 3. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν γραμματέων, &c.] It is true indeed, that at this time the power of inflicting capital Puniſhments was taken away from the *Jews* by the *Romans*; but the *Jews* had no occaſion to enquire about this matter of *Chriſt*, who might eaſily have anſwered them, that the Woman deſerved indeed, according to the Law of *Moſes*, to be put to Death, but that the execution of the Puniſhment depended upon the pleaſure of the *Roman Preſident*. There was no room here for any ſcruple, and I do not conceive how the Scribes or Phariſees could have taken any occaſion to accuſe *Chriſt* if he had given them this ready anſwer, tho he declined it by giving them that which follows.

Verſ. 6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας, &c.] Thoſe who are of opinion that this Story is ſuppoſititious, might probably enough ſuſpect that *Papias* or ſome other, borrowed this Circumſtance here mentioned from that which is related of *Menedemus*, as it is thus ſet down by *Diogenes Laertius*, Lib. 2. §. 127. Ἦν δὲ ἐπιτιμητικὸς καὶ παῤῥησιαστής, μισεχθὴς γάρ καὶ ἀποδεκτικώτατος, ὅτι μὲν οὖν, λαθὼν δὲ κάτω διέγραψεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ πεφαιδρυμένα

Chapter VIII. χῆμα, ὡς ἰδιώτην πίστιν συνὶν τὸ μωρόχιον τὴν ὕβριν, ἀπολλάχθη. *For he was a Man that took a great liberty in talking, and used to jeer People; and once when a young Man spake something roughly and sharply to him, he made him indeed no answer, but taking up a little stick he drew upon the ground the figure of a Man,* muliebria patientis, *till the young man perceiving the Affront put upon him before all there present, went away.*

Vers. 7. Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν πρῶτος ἐπὶ αὐτὴν βαλέτω.] But no Law makes it requisite, that those who bring a Criminal taken in the very act to judgment, should be perfectly innocent themselves. It is sufficient if they do but prove him to be really guilty of the Crime they charge him with, by competent Witnesses. And besides, by giving such an answer as this, *Christ* might have exposed himself to the invidious Censures both of the *Jews* and *Romans*: for the *Jews* might have said, that he made the Law of no force, because he stioked at pronouncing a Harlot to be worthy of death; and did in effect affirm, that Offenders could not justly be punished but by those who were conscious of no guilt themselves. And the *Romans* might have complained that he would have had the Power of inflicting capital Punishments restored to the *Jews*, because he authorized those of that Nation that were innocent, to stone a Woman to death: I confess I do not see what danger *Christ* could think to avoid by such an answer.

Vers. 9. Ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι.] Is it credible that all that were there present had been guilty of Adultery, or some other crime as heinous as that, not so much as one excepted? That the Nation of the *Jews* was extremely corrupted at that time I grant; but it is improbable that lewd Men who had committed Adultery themselves, or been guilty of as great a sin otherwise, should be for having an Adulteress condemned to death.

Vers. 10. Οὐδείς σε κατέκρινεν.] This question could not properly be made in such general terms, for she might have been *condemned* by one, *viz.* the *Roman Procurator*: For the word κατέκρινεν cannot be understood but of such a Condemnation, because questionless every one of them *condemned*, that is, disapproved Adultery, at least in words; and *Christ* himself accounted it a very great Crime.

Vers. 13. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής] *i. e.* Your testimony does not only deserve to be rejected by us, but you your self cannot reasonably believe your self in this case, because you may be deceived by self-love: you think you are the Light of the World, but you ought also to regard the judgment of others who think otherwise. That this is the meaning of these words *Christ's* answer shews, *My Testimony is true, because I know whence I came*, &c. which is as if he had said, I am sure I am not

not deceived, I do not ſpeak out of love to my ſelf, for I know that I was ſent from God. Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 18. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν, &c.] The Teſtimony of two Witneſſes was principally required, when the queſtion was about the puniſhment of a Criminal: See *Numb.* xxxv. 30. *Deut.* xvii. 6. and xix. 15. For any one to prove himſelf a *Prophet*, he needed no other witneſs of his Miſſion but *God*, who confirmed his word by a Miracle: See *Deut.* xviii.

Ibid. Μὴ σπανιεῖ;] *Tan. Faber* in his *Epiſt. Crit.* conjectured that it ought to be read σπουδεῖ, *go afar off*. But as long as the ſenſe is good according to the vulgar reading of the word, and all *Copies* as well as Interpreters favor that reading, it ought by all means to ſtand as it is.

Verſ. 25. *Note* b. There is a third, not leſs probable, interpretation that may be given of theſe words τὴν ἀρχὴν, *viz.* for *jam tum*, *already*, or at that very time, *i. e.* in the beginning of this my Diſcourſe with you. So the *old Onomaſticon*; τὴν ἀρχὴν, *jam tum*, *already*, I have told you what I was; *the Light of the World*, verſ. 12.

Verſ. 29. *Note* c. 1. I eaſily believe our Learned Author when he ſays, that the Phraſe *Common-Pleas* in Engliſh ſignifies a *Court* of Judicature; for it is hard if he did not underſtand his own Language: but that in *Latin* the phraſe *Placita Principum*, and *Arreſts of Parliament* among the French ſignifies any thing but the *Decrees* of both, no body would ſay that would not be guilty of an intolerable impropriety of Speech, which is a thing the *Doctor* never ſcrupled.

2. What need was there of recurring to this? ἀρεστὰ τῷ are thoſe things that are *grateful* or *pleaſing to God*, without enquiring any further: And ſo in *Acts* vi. 2. the phraſe οὐκ ἀρεστόν does not ſignify *'tis not determined*, but it is not grateful or pleaſing to us to leave the word of *God* and ſerve Tables. And *Acts* xii. 3. ἀρεστὸν Ἰουδαίοις is not *what was determined* or *voted by the Jews*, but *what was pleaſing to them*, with whom *Herod* endeavoured to ingratiate himſelf, as ſufficiently appears by the paſſage alledged by the *Doctor* out of *Euſebius*. What he ſays, he ſeems to have taken from *Budæus*, who out of love to the Greek Language, thought that the French word *arreſt* ought to be derived from the Greek ἄρεστον, whereas it manifeſtly comes from *arrêter*, which ſometimes ſignifies to *decree* or *determine*, and is derived from the Latin Verb *reſtare*, from which comes the French *reſter*, *to ſtay*. But he has produced no example out of any Greek Writer, to ſhew that ἄρεστον ſignifies a *decree* or *determination*.

3. It is utterly falſe, what our Author ſays about the *Roman* Cuſtom's being obſerved in the *Provinces*, where he ſpeaks of *Capital* Cauſes:

Chapter VIII.

Cauſes: For tho the Citizens of *Rome*, whilſt the Commonwealth ſtood, might appeal firſt to the *People*, and then to the *Emperor* in ſuch Cauſes; and accordingly the Magiſtrates, whilſt the Commonwealth ſtood, could not condemn any one, either without the conſent of the People if they were appealed to, or without the Authority of the Emperor, if an Appeal was afterwards made to him; yet it will not follow that what the *Doctor* ſays is true. Whilſt the Government of the *Roman* Empire was in the hands of *more* than one, the *Roman* Magiſtrates no where expected the Suffrage of their *Provincials*, to empower them to condemn or abſolve; and much leſs did they do ſo, when the ſupreme Authority came to be lodged in the hands of the *Emperors*. Tho the *Jews* were permitted to live according to their own Laws, yet at that time they had no power to ſentence any one to death, as appears from *Chap.* xviii. 31. when *Pilate* condemned *Chriſt* becauſe of the importunity of the *Jews*, he did it to *gratify* them, when he might have refuſed to do it; and not as our *Author* thought, becauſe he was *obliged* to do ſo, as I have elſewhere already obſerved. The *Proconſuls*, *Pretors* and *Procurators*, did always with unlimited Authority, by the advice of their Council, *i. e.* a few *Roman* Citizens, paſs ſentence upon their Provincials, without ever *conſulting* or convening their Provincials, unleſs they had a particular mind to gratify them. This ſufficiently appears by *Cicero*'s Orations againſt *Verres*. But the *Doctor* objects that *Pilate* asked the Multitude; *What then ſhall I do with Jeſus, who is called Chriſt?* as if he waited for their Suffrages. I anſwer, it is certain that the common People of the *Jews* condemned none, no not whilſt their Commonwealth ſtood. This Office belonged to the *Judges*, and in ſuch Cauſes as theſe, to thoſe of the Great *Sanhedrim*; ſee *Grotius* on *Mat.* v. 22. And after *Judæa* was made a *Roman Province*, the common people had not, I ſuppoſe, a greater Power allowed them, than they ever had by the Laws of their own Country. The reaſon therefore why *Pilate* asked the multitude this queſtion, was not that he might hear their reſolution or determination, without which he could not have proceeded to paſs Sentence, either of Abſolution or Condemnation; but becauſe he thought they favoured *Chriſt*, and would have reſcued him out of the hands of the chief Men among the *Jews*, who had accuſed him out of malice and envy, as St. *Mark* in ſetting down this ſtory tells us. He could have releaſed him indeed without their conſent, if he had not feared a Sedition; but he thought it better to condemn the innocent than to run that hazard. This is apparent from the relation that all the *Evangeliſts* give us of this

this matter, according to which the people did not condemn *Christ* by any Authority they had so to do, but seditiously demanded of *Pilate* his life. *Pilate* did not in the least act in this case as a *Tribune of the People*, who upon the peoples determination pronounced sentence in the name of the Commons; but as the *Roman Presidents* used to act, who gave judgment according to the advice of their Counsel. I have been the larger upon this subject, lest Dr. *Hammond*'s Authority should deceive such as are not very well versed in the *Roman* Customs. Or else to skilful Persons, it had been sufficient just to admonish them of his mistake. Chapter IX.

Vers. 48. *Note* d. I have observed in my Notes on *Gen.* xxxi. 20. that the name of *Syrian* carries in it something, I know not what, reproachful; see there. *Levit.* xxv. 47. is a false quotation in our Author for *Deut.* xxvi. 5. for in this place indeed we may find the word *Aramæan* used in a bad sense, but in the other there is no mention made of *Aramæans*. Many such faults there are in Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations, which are owing either to the carelessness of the Printers, or the Author's thoughts being otherwise employed, which is no strange thing, and I do not reproach him with it.

CHAP. IX.

Vers. 2. *Note* a. IT was a long while before this time, that many of the Jews believed the preexistence of Souls, and that they were sent down into such or such Bodies according to their several deserts, as appears evidently by these words in the Book of *Wisdom*, Chap. viii. 19, 20. παῖς ἦμην εὐφυὴς, ψυχῆς τε λαχὼν ἀγαθῆς, μᾶλλον δ' ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον: *I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea rather being good, I came into a body undefiled.*

Vers. 22. *Note* b. Of this word συναγωγὸς *Selden* has treated at large, *Lib.* 1. c. 7. *de Synedriis*. And if we believe him, συναγωγὴ here signifies any assembly of people whatever, publick as well as private, in which it was not lawful for any that were συναγωγοὶ, *put out of the Synagogue*, familiarly to converse. But they were not excluded from the publick Prayers, or forbidden to be present at Sacrifices, as the same Author shews, who is well worth our reading, and to whom I refer the Reader, tho all are not of his opinion.

CHAP.

Chapter X.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 35. *Note* b. IT muſt be obſerved that the word *Law* includes ſometimes the Book of *Pſalms*, (ſee *Chap.* xii. 34.) as ſometimes all the Old Teſtament is called the *Law* and the *Prophets*; tho ordinarily it is divided into three parts, whereof a third makes the ἁγιόγραφα, under which the Book of *Pſalms* is contained.

CHAP. XI.

Chapter XI.

Verſ. 4. Οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς θάνατον] *i. e.* ſhall not die of this Diſeaſe as others do, who continue under the power of Death till the general Reſurrection. It is a form of ſpeech peculiar to St. *John*: So in his 1 *Epiſt.* v. 16, 17. by ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον he means, a ſin that is not of ſuch a nature, as to make it probable that the Sinner will continue ſpiritually dead as long as he lives: See the Notes upon that place.

Verſ. 22. Ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν οἶδα, &c.] Theſe words have no agreement with *Chriſt*'s anſwer, unleſs ſomething be underſtood which is not expreſſed, and which *Chriſt* perceived to be in *Martha*'s mind. Our Author ſhould have ſolv'd this difficulty in his Paraphraſe; which becauſe he has not done, I ſhall endeavour to do my ſelf. "*Ver.* 21. And "when ſhe was come to him and had ſaluted him, ſhe told him that "ſhe ſhould have been very glad if he had come ſome days before to "*Bethany*; becauſe he would then have healed her Brother, who had "been dead now four days, and ſo he would have been ſtill alive. "22. But now he was dead, there was no hope of recovering him; "for tho ſhe very well knew that *God* would grant *Jeſus* whatſoever he "asked of him, yet ſhe hardly believed that he would raiſe up a dead "man at his requeſt. 23. To which *Chriſt* replied, that *Lazarus* "ſhould be raiſed up again. 24. But *Martha* ſaying, that ſhe did not "doubt indeed but he ſhould at the univerſal Reſurrection; 25. *Jeſus* "told her more plainly, that *God* had endued him with a Power to "bring the dead to life again, eſpecially thoſe that had believed on "him. I have here expreſſed the whole connexion of the diſcourſe, that the ſenſe might be the more evident. But the 22*d verſe* might alſo be thus expreſſed: "That ſhe knew indeed that all that the *Lord* "*Jeſus* asked of his *Father* would be granted him. She did not dare "to add, that ſhe did not believe he would preſume to ask his Father

"to

" to raise a man that had been dead four days to life. 23. But this being " in her thoughts, *Christ* answered, &c. *Christ* answered therefore ὡς τὸ συνιέντων τι to something not expressed; and it is easy to understand the reason of the συνωπισις, *viz.* that *Martha* broke off her discourse for fear of offending her Lord. Unless this Interpretation be admitted, the 22*d verse* must be placed after the 27*th*, and then there will be no difficulty in the series of the discourse: But this would be contrary to the Authority of all the Copies. Chapter XII.

Vers. 39. Ἤδη ὄζει.] Our Author represents *Martha* in his Paraphrase speaking too learnedly, according to the opinion of some Physicians, for she never thought perhaps of the time of the revolution of the Humors. And indeed as the thing it self is false, so it is nothing at all to the purpose. The revolution of the Blood is completed in a shorter time, and the *climate* or *season of the year* is the chief thing to be considered, when the discourse is concerning the *putrefaction* of a dead body; but this is not very material.

Vers. 48. *Note* b. Our learned Author had done well to produce the Testimony of some antient Writer, that related what he said here concerning *Armillus*; for the later *Rabbins* fancy a great many things for which they have no Tradition. We read indeed in a *Chaldee* Paraphrase which is said to be *Jonathans*, on *Isa.* ii. 4. that a *wicked Armillus* should be slain by the *Messias*. But who shall certify us of the time when this *Jonathan* lived? For it is childish to give credit to the boasting pretences of the *Jews*. I am apt to think that by this word these men meant the *Romans*, whose Empire, after the destruction of *Jerusalem* by them, they had a very great spite against, and therefore gave out that it should be overthrown by the *Messias*. Afterwards they invented some other stories about this *Armillus*; of which see *Buxtorf*'s *Lexic. Talmudicum.*

CHAP. XII.

Vers. 28. Δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα.] One of the Copies of *R. Stephanus* has μου instead of σου, because the Transcriber thought that this agreed better with *Christ*'s discourse. And the Author of the *Coptick* Translation seems to have read τὸν σου. But there is no need of these Alterations, for God the Father *glorifies his Name*, when he openly acknowledges his Son whom he sent to men in his Name; see *Psal.* cxvi. 1. and afterwards *Chap.* xiii. 31, 32. of this Gospel.

Chapter XIII.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 26. *Note* c. THE Doctor's conjecture is confirmed by *Heſychius* and *Phavorinus*, who interpret βασλὶν by ἀντλημίνν. And ſo I find βάσλευν expounded by ἀφύσσω *to draw*, in the *Lexicons*, out of the Scholiaſt on *Nicander*.

Verſ. 27. Ὁ πωῖς πίνων.] See my Notes on *Exod.* iv. 13.

CHAP. XIV.

Chapter XIV.

Verſ. 14. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου.] This phraſe deſerved in the Paraphraſe at leaſt to be expreſſed in other words, for a great many uſe it every day that do not underſtand it. And therefore I ſhall here briefly explain it. The *Jews* uſed to ask God, particularly in their ſolemneſt Prayers, in the name of their Forefathers, and eſpecially the Patriarchs and Prophets; *i. e.* to pray to *God* that he would grant them their requeſts, becauſe they were their Poſterity, and called by their Name, or *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*'s Poſterity: This was to call upon *God* in the name of the Patriarchs. But *Chriſt* would have his Diſciples to pray to God *in his Name*, i. e. to deſire what they would have granted to them, becauſe they were called, and were the Diſciples of *Chriſt*. So the *gathered together in the Name of Chriſt*, are *Chriſtian* Aſſemblies in oppoſition to an Aſſembly of *Jews*; ſee *Mat.* xviii. 20. And ſo afterwards, *verſ.* 26. of this *Chapter*, the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to be ſent *in the Name of Chriſt*, i. e. as that Spirit which was to be called the *Spirit of Chriſt*, and to be conferred only on Chriſt's Diſciples. A great many Paſſages may receive light from this Interpretation.

Verſ. 16. *Note* b. What our *Author* obſerves about the ſignification of the Greek words, is very true; but that *Chriſt* uſed the word ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲗⲏⲧⲟⲥ, as the *Talmudiſts* did מרקליט, or פרקליטא *phraklita*, I very much doubt. Perhaps he uſed מנחמן *mnahhman*, which in *Syriack* ſignifies only a *Comforter*; and if that were out of doubt, the *Greek* were to have no other ſignification put upon it. It is certain that there is no Hebrew word of the ſame latitude with the Greek ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲗⲏⲧⲟⲥ.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Verſ. 7. *Note* a. Col. 2. Lin. 14. THERE is not the leaſt footſtep of any mention made of the Devil in this matter by *Moſes*. Our learned *Author* lent the Prophet, before he was aware, his own conjecture.

CHAP. XVII.

Verſ. 1. Ἐπῆρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς] *Grotius* conjectures that this Prayer was conceived in the view of the Temple, when *Chriſt* went into the Garden of *Gethſemane*. But if we carefully read *Chap.* xiii. 21. it will ſeem rather to have been pronounced in the ſame Room in which the Paſſover was celebrated after *Judas*'s departure; and that *Chriſt* did not go with his Diſciples into the Garden till he had ſaid this Prayer, becauſe *Chap.* xviii. begins thus; *When Jeſus had ſpoken theſe words, he went forth with his Diſciples over the Brook* Cedron.

Verſ. 3. Ἵνα γινώσκωσι σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν.] Theſe words muſt be rendred thus; *That they may know thee who art the only true God, and Jeſus who is the Chriſt that thou haſt ſent:* For the article τὸν muſt be repeated before the word Chriſt. 'Tis as if the ſenſe were expreſſed by the Infinitive Mood thus; *That they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jeſus to be the Meſſias whom thou haſt ſent,* as if it had been ſaid in Greek, ὅτι σὺ ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεὸς, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός. *Chriſt* here ſays, *that this is eternal Life*, not becauſe the whole Chriſtian Faith in its greateſt extent, is comprehended under theſe two Heads conſidered in themſelves; but becauſe theſe two things are, as it were, the foundations of all the reſt, to believe him who is the Father of *Jeſus Chriſt*, to be the only true *God*, and *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſias* whom he purpoſed to ſend. Without theſe Chriſtianity cannot ſtand, becauſe all the reſt of the Truths aſſerted in it are built upon theſe; and theſe being admitted as true, every one muſt admit the reſt, and regulate his Life according to them, unleſs he be mad, and reſolve to be inconſiſtent with himſelf, as every body eaſily perceives: See *verſ.* 7, 8, 25.

Verſ. 6. Ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.] Tho the word κόσμος ſignifies *all Men* in this Goſpel, yet in this *Chapter* it ſeems to reſpect principally the *Jews*, as that word is alſo uſed elſewhere by St. *John*, as I have obſerved in a Note on *Chap.* iv. 42. That *Chriſt* choſe Diſciples out of all Mankind,

Chapter XVII. is too general a Phraſe to ſignify his chooſing ſome *Jews*. Thus *verſ.* 14. ὁ κοσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτὸς ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τῦ κόσμυ, *the World hateth them becauſe they are not of the World:* by the word κόσμος there is meant the *wicked Jews*, who hated the Apoſtles becauſe they were no longer of their number; and not the Heathens to whom they were perfectly unknown.

Verſ. 12. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί συ] *i. e.* by a Power derived from thee, being preſent with them, and acting as an Embaſſador in thy Name, and taking upon me that Character. There ſeems here to be underſtood, Νῦν δὲ τήρησον αὐτὸς, ἐμοῦ ἀπόντος, διὰ τῦ πνεύματός συ, *but do thou keep them in my abſence, by thy Spirit.* For there is nothing ſet to anſwer the words, *while I was with them in the World I kept them in thy Name*, in what comes after, which yet the context requires: And therefore what *Chriſt* did not expreſs in words, he made up in his thoughts, as the Apoſtles eaſily underſtood, for whoſe ſake this Prayer was made. And accordingly after *Chriſt*'s Aſcenſion the Holy Ghoſt came down to ſupply his place, as *Chriſt* had promiſed, *Chap.* xvi. 7, 13.

Verſ. 15. Ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτὸς ἐκ τῦ κόσμυ] *i. e.* I do not pray thee to take them away from this wicked Generation of Men, and particularly of *Jews*, and within a few days tranſlate them along with me into the regions of Happineſs; but that thou wouldſt preſerve them from being corrupted by thoſe evil Cuſtoms and Opinions with which Mankind is ſo univerſally infected. By the *World* here, we are to underſtand wicked Men whom the Apoſtles could not avoid converſing with.

Ibid. Ἁγίασον αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συ] *i. e.* Cauſe them to be ſo affected with that true Doctrin that I have taught them, as to expreſs it in their Lives. And indeed whoever underſtands Chriſt's Doctrin, and thinks it to be true, if he ſuffers that thought to ſink deep into his Mind, *will* at length *be ſanctified by the Truth.* The *Doctor* did not underſtand theſe words, as appears by his Paraphraſe. There is an expreſſion much to the ſame purpoſe in *Chap.* viii. 31, 32. *Then ſaid Jeſus to thoſe Jews which believed on him; If ye continue in my word, then are ye my Diſciples indeed, and ye ſhall know the Truth, and the Truth ſhall make you free.* It is all one as to the ſenſe, whether we ſay *to be made free by the Truth*, or *to be ſanctified* by it.

Verſ. 19. Ἵνα ᾖ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἡγιασμένος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ συ] *i. e.* I offer up my ſelf a Sacrifice to thee, to obtain for them the pardon of their Sins, and alſo the Spirit of Sanctification, that they may be ſo affected with the Truth they are to preach, as to regulate their actions according to it, as I have done. *Chriſt* puts up this Petition principally for his *Apoſtles*, becauſe it was impoſſible they ſhould preach the Goſpel with

any

any ſucceſs, if they did not live according to its Precepts. There could not have been a greater prejudice to the ſucceſs of the Goſpel, than the ill Life of thoſe that preached it: and next to the Apoſtles were all other Chriſtians, upon whoſe behaviour the ſucceſs of the Goſpel did alſo depend, and for whom Chriſt therefore prays. This is the deſign of the following words, and therein lies that agreement both in Doctrin and ſanctity of Life, whereby the Apoſtles would become *one* among themſelves, and *one* with *Chriſt*, as *Chriſt* himſelf had been *one* with God. Theſe things are not ſufficiently expreſſed in our Author's Paraphraſe. Chapter XVIII.

Verſ. 22. Τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς.] This is rightly interpreted by the *Doctor* of the Power of working Miracles, conſequent upon which is their obtaining the higheſt Credit and Authority with thoſe who ſaw the Miracles which were done by them. So likewiſe in *Numb.* xxvii. 20. the Hebrew הוֹד *hod*, which the *Septuagint* render δόξαν, ſignifies that *Authority* which *Moſes* at his Death conferred upon his Succeſſor *Joſhua*. *Thou ſhalt transfer*, ſaith God there, [*ſome*] *of thine Authority to him, that all the Congregation of the* Iſraelites *may be obedient to him.* Δώσεις τῆς δόξης σου ἐπ' αὐτόν, as it is in the *Septuagint*.

Verſ. 24. Πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.] The *Doctor* renders this in his Paraphraſe, *before all eternity*, which is an unſufferably improper Phraſe, elſewhere made uſe of by him, as I have already obſerved. This is what I had to obſerve upon this Chapter, on which our Author has made no Annotations. But for a more full explication of it, I refer the Reader to *H. Grotius*, whom the *Doctor* follows in his Paraphraſe; deſiring this may ſtand only as a Supplement to what *Grotius* has ſaid.

CHAP. XVIII.

Verſ. 10. Ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος. There are ſome who tell us that this name muſt not be derived from the Verb מלך *to reign*; and their reaſon is, becauſe a Servant would never have had ſuch a Name given him, as imported authority in it: But notwithſtanding that reaſon, this was a very uſual name, and common to Noble Perſons with Ignoble. Thus *Porphyrie*, who being a *Tyrian* had a *Phœnician* name, was called *Malchus*. His own words in the Life of *Plotinus*, where he ſpeaks of a Book that was dedicated to him by *Amelius*, are theſe: περιφέρουσι δὲ αὐτὸ βασιλεῖ ἑαυτοῦ. Βασιλεὺς δὲ τότε ἦν Περσικοῦ ἐμοὶ σφόδρα, καὶ ἦν πάτριον διάλεκτον Μάλχῳ καλουμένῳ· ὅπερ μοι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὄνομα κέκληκτο· τῇ δὲ Μάλχᾳ ἑρμήνευμα ἔχοντος βασιλεύς, ἅτε εἰς Ἑλληνίδα διάλεκτον μεταβαλλόντων ἰδίᾳ: *he dedicated that Book to me under the title*

Chapter XIX.

title of a King; *and I* Porphyrius *had this name of King, becauſe I was called* Malchus *in my own Country Dialect, which was alſo the name of my Father*; *for* Malchus, *if it be turned into Greek, ſignifies King.* There was alſo one *Malchus* a Hermit, whoſe Life is written by St. *Jerom*; *There was*, ſays he, *there a certain old Man named* Malchus, *whom we in* Latin *may call* Regem *a King, by Birth and Language a* Syrian. Whence it appears that this was a very common name in *Syria*, as *Luc. Holſtenius* has alſo ſhewn by many examples, in the *life of Porphyrius*, Chap. ii.

Verſ. 31. *Note* c. See the words of the *Rabbins* themſelves, concerning the power of Judicature in Capital cauſes being taken away from the *Jews*, as they are ſet down by Dr. *Lightfoot* on this place. It is no good cuſtom to mention Authors names and words, without citing the very place, as the Criticks of the laſt Age generally do. Of the manner of hanging, conſult the Talmudical Book *de Synedrio*, Cap. 6. §. 4.

CHAP. XIX.

Verſ. 14. *Note* b. WHAT our Author has here is borrowed from *Grotius*, who ſays the ſame in his Notes on *Mat.* xxvii. 45. and confirms it by Teſtimonies. But there are ſeveral things to be obſerved in relation to what *Grotius* there ſays, which I ſhall briefly ſet down. 1. He produces a paſſage out of *Ignatius*, as in his Epiſtle to the Inhabitants of *Smyrna*, which is not in *that* Epiſtle, but in his *Epiſtle* to the *Trallians*. 2. He makes uſe of an *Interpolator* inſtead of the true *Ignatius*, but in this he ought to be excuſed, becauſe *Ignatius*'s true Epiſtles were not then publiſhed by themſelves. 3. But it is ſtrange that he ſhould alledg that Paſſage as agreeable to the reading of our Copies, both in St. *Mark* and St. *John*, when if we believe that Interpolator, we ought in St. *John* to read *the third* and not the *ſixth Hour*; and in St. *Mark*, the *ſixth*, not the *third*, juſt contrary to the reading of the Copies: For *his* words in *Chap.* 9. *Ep. ad Trall.* are theſe: τῇ γὰρ Παρασκευῇ, τρίτης ὥρας ἐπράσσετο ἐπὶ τῷ Πιλάτῳ, συγχωρήσαντος τοῦ Πατρός· ἕκτης ὥρας ἐσταυροῦτο, ἐνάτης ἀπέθνησκε: *on friday therefore, at the third hour he received ſentence of Death from* Pilate, *the Father ſo permitting it*; *at the ſixth hour he was crucified*; *at the ninth he expired.* But St. *Mark* ſays, ἦν δὲ τρίτη ὥρα καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, *it was the third Hour, and they crucified him.* And according to St. *John* he did not receive the Sentence of Death, but ὡρεὶ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη, *about the ſixth Hour.* 4. The *Clementine Conſtitutions*, which *Grotius* alſo quotes, ſay

ſay the ſame, *Lib.* 5. *c.* 14. and *Lib.* 8. *c.* 34. and almoſt in the ſame words; whereby the Author of them appears to have thought that the Hours of Chriſt's Condemnation ought to be ſo diſtributed as to make that in which he received the Sentence of Death to have been the *third* (and not as it is in our Copies of St. *John*, the *ſixth*) and that of his Crucifixion the *ſixth*, and not (as we read it now in St. *Mark*) the *third*. 5. And yet that Great Man infers from the Authority of *Ignatius* and the *Clementine Conſtitutions*, that we ought not to admit any alteration, *contrary to the Authority of the moſt antient Copies, and of the Metaphraſts*. But not to ſay again, that the contrary ought to have been inferred, I would fain know what *Metaphraſts* he means? *Nonnus* it is certain, who generally goes only by that name, expreſſes himſelf in his Metaphraſis of St. *John*, ſo as that he ſeems to have read in him τείτην and not ἕκτην, for he ſays thus: Chapter XIX.

Ἦν δὲ πρωτομόρη τρίτατον σκιπόδος ὦρη.

The third mortal Hour was lengthened out; *i. e.* was not yet paſt. And it is plain that if the Hours be thus diſpoſed, and the *Evangeliſts* ſuppoſed to have written ſo, there will be no difficulty; and it is highly probable that there was a conſiderable interval of time between *Pilate*'s pronouncing the Sentence and *Chriſt*'s Crucifixion. For there was a *Croſs* to be provided, which perhaps was not yet got ready; and it would take up ſome time to go to the *place of Execution*, becauſe *Chriſt* was not well able to carry his Croſs, and then there muſt be ſome time alſo allowed for their *crucifying* him.

It can hardly be doubted but that it was ſo, and therefore if *Chriſt* was not condemned, properly ſpeaking, till a little before the ſixth Hour, as the *Doctor* ſuppoſes, it will be difficult to underſtand how he was crucified in the ſecond quarter of the day. And yet I hardly think that the *Copies* of both the *Evangeliſts* are corrupted. It would not indeed be incredible that St. *Mark* was corrected out of St. *John*, or St. *John* out of St. *Mark*; and there are frequent inſtances of ſuch corrections as thoſe; but that this ſeeming contrariety between them is owing to the corrections of ſome Criticks is not credible: and therefore I am apt to think that the ordinary reading is true, but we muſt take another Method to ſolve the difficulty.

St. *Mark* who wrote before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, ſeems to have reckoned the Hours after the manner of the *Jews*: and the *Jews* dated their firſt Hour from the riſing of the Sun, and ſo by the third Hour we muſt underſtand the third from that time, *viz.* the Sun's riſing;

Chapter XIX.

rising; and accordingly if we suppose that the Sun (pursuant to our way of computation from Midnight) rose about six a Clock, that which is St. *Mark*'s *third* Hour will be our *ninth*. And the relation which the *Evangelists* give us of this matter, makes it reasonable to think that *Christ* was not crucified sooner. For early in the Morning he was sent by the *Sanhedrim*, and accused before *Pilate*, *Mat.* xxvii. 1, 2. *Mark* xv. 1. *John* xviii. 28. Then *Pilate* questioned him, and sent him to *Herod*, and tried to rescue him out of the hands of the *Jews*, by ordering him only to be scourged, and suffering him to be mocked; and at last being no longer able to resist the *Jews* importunity, he condemned him. And about the third hour from the rising of the Sun we will suppose that he was fastened to the Cross; and after he had hanged there three hours, at the sixth from the Sun's rising, but the twelfth from Midnight, began that darkness mentioned in *Mat.* xxvii. 45. which rested till the ninth (*i. e.* our three in the Afternoon) upon *Judæa*. And then a little after the ninth *Christ* expired.

But how then is it said by St. *John*, that *Christ* was condemned about the sixth Hour? *viz.* according to the custom of the old *Romans* who used to reckon the beginning of their *civil* or *artificial* day from Midnight: of which see *A. Gellius Noct. Attic.* Lib. 3. c. 2. & *Censorinus de die Natali*, c. xxiii. I grant the same way of computation obtained afterwards among the *Romans* as among the *Jews*; but nevertheless the old Custom might also continue in some parts of the Empire: and therefore *Plutarch* in his *Quæst. Rom.* 83. makes it a matter of enquiry as a thing then in use, διὰ τι τὴν τῶς ἡμερῶν ἀρχὴν ἐκ μέσης νυκτὸς λαμβάνουσι; *why they counted the beginning of the day from Midnight?* And this Custom was probably followed by St. *John*, who wrote a great while after the destruction of *Jerusalem*.

Vers. 23. Ἦν δὲ ὁ χιτὼν ἄρραφος] If we believe the conjecture of *Oct. Ferrarius* de Re Vest. Lib. 3. c. 16. this Coat was like our silk or worsted Stockings, which are knit with long Needles: or at least if that art was not then found out, it was, as he thinks, made only with bands without any Needle, and of the nature of small Nets, or a particular sort of Hoods which Women sometimes wear. And upon this account, he supposes, it is said to be ἄνωθεν ὑφαντὸς, i. e. *wrought upwards*, and δι' ὅλου, *i.e.* orbicularly, and all together, without having any Seam made in it. After this manner were made *the straight Garments which Fathers*, as *Festus* tells us, *caused to be wove for their Children, as an omen of their being lucky*; so called, because they were wrought from the bottom upwards, and by Persons standing: which Custom also prevailed amongst the Inhabitants of *Palæstine*, as has been shewn by learned

learned Men out of *Theophylact*. But *Euthymius* tells us, that this Coat was wrought from the upper parts, juſt, *ſaith he*, as amongſt us the Winter-coverings for the Head or Feet; and he is in the right, for the Phraſe ἀπ' ἄνωθεν cannot ſignify *towards* the top *upwards*, as *Ferrarius* would have it, but *from* the top *downwards*, ſo as Stockings uſe to be knit. Chapter XX.

However, thoſe are miſtaken who are of opinion that the Workmanſhip of this Coat was extraordinary rare and curious, which does not at all ſute with the humility and poverty of Chriſt. Let us rather hear what *Iſidorus Peluſiota* ſays, Lib. 1. Ep. 74. Τίς δ' ἀγνοεῖ τὸν ἀτίλεων ἐξ ἀδύτου ἐκείνης, ἔνθα οἱ πτωχοὶ κἀχρηστοι Γαλιλαίων, καθ' οὓς ἦ μάλιστα τὸ τοιοῦτο φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι ἱμάτιον, ὡς ἂν συνδεσμίδας, ἀνάκειται ἢ ὑφαντόμενον; *But who does not know the meanneſs of that Garment which the poor of the Galileans wore, amongſt whom chiefly this ſort of Garment uſed to be made, like Stomachers preſſed or wove?*

Verſ. 35. *Note* e. *lin.* 29.] *Bartholinus* in *Diſſ. de latere Chriſti aperto* has treated more exactly of this whole matter, who may be conſulted.

CHAP. XX.

Verſ. 23. *Note* d. SUppoſing the ſame thing to be conferred upon the Apoſtles in this place, as in *Matth.* xvi and xviii. Our Author juſtly rejects the interpretation of Mr. *Selden*. But perhaps ſome may doubt whether it be juſt the ſame thing which is promiſed in both theſe paſſages, they being delivered upon different occaſions, and no proof being given that the promiſe made in them is the ſame. And beſides, the ſenſe of the phraſes *to remit* and *retain Sins*, is ſometimes quite different from that which can belong to them in the buſineſs of the excommunication of an Offender, or the admiſſion of a Penitent. The phraſe *to remit ſin* in the New Teſtament, ſignifies ſometimes to deliver a perſon from the puniſhment inflicted upon him by *God* for his ſins; and if we admit that ſenſe here, *to retain ſins* will be to inflict or continue the infliction of ſuch puniſhment. Thus *Matth.* ix. 2. *Thy ſins are remitted to thee*, is all one as, I deliver thee from thy Palſy, which has been ſent upon thee as a puniſhment for thy ſins, as the following words manifeſtly ſhew, and Dr. *Hammond* acknowledges; and ſo if we apply the phraſe in this ſenſe to this place, that which *Chriſt* here beſtows upon his Apoſtles, will be a power *of delivering up to Satan*, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, *i. e.* of inflicting diſeaſes upon the impenitent,

Chapter XX. and curing them upon their repentance. Which Power depending upon the gift of doing Miracles, can have no place where that gift is not conferred, as learned men have obſerved on 1 *Cor.* v.

Thus alſo *to bind*, ſignifies ſometimes to inflict diſeaſes, and *to looſe*, to cure them. So *Luke* xiii. 12. *Chriſt* ſpeaking to the Woman that had been diſeaſed eighteen years, ſays: Ἀπολέλυσαι, *thou art looſed from thine infirmity.* And, *ver.* 16. *Ought not this Daughter of* Abraham, *whom Satan hath bound* ἰδοὺ, *behold theſe eighteen years, be looſed from that bond* λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου. So that granting our Author that the ſame thing, as it ſeems to be, is intended in *Mat.* xviii. and here; yet it does not follow, that Chriſt ſpeaks of mere excommunication, without any diſeaſe conſequent upon it. Let the Learned conſider and judg of this matter.

Verſ. 27. Καὶ ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου.] After *Chriſt* had ſaid, *Reach hither thy finger*, it was conſequent that he ſhould ſay, Καὶ ψηλάφησον τὰς χεῖράς μου, *and* feel *my hands*, or ſomething like that, for we do not reach out our finger to *ſee* a thing, but to *feel* or *touch* it. And therefore there is an impropriety of ſpeech here, ordinary in every ones diſcourſe, whereby we apply a word that belongs properly to *one ſenſe*, to *another*. And particularly, nothing is more common than to find this Verb *to ſee*, uſed for that which is to try or examin by ſome other ſenſe. See *Exod.* xx. 18. and more Examples which have been collected by *Sal. Glaſſius Rhet. Sacr. Tract.* 1. *Cap.* 12. where he treats of the Metaphors that are taken from human ſenſes. However, *Chriſt* ſeems to have kept the marks of the Nails and Spear uncloſed, that that might be a certain ſign to know him by; otherwiſe he needed not to have left the leaſt ſign of them in his body.

Ibid. Εἰς τὴν πλευράν μου.] He does not add εἰς τοὺς πόδας μου, becauſe his feet had not been pierced through with nails, but only bound, contrary to what our Painters and Statuaries now adays generally think. And therefore Dr. *Hammond* alſo well obſerves, that the Legs of the Thieves were broken, that they might not be able to run away; which the Roman Procurator would never have been apprehenſive of, if both their feet had been faſtened to the Croſs by a huge nail driven through the ſoles of them.

Verſ. 28. Ὁ κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ θεός μου.] Tho the Nominative caſe is often put for the Vocative, I chuſe rather with the *Vulgar* to uſe here the *Nominative*, as if the words σὺ εἶ were to be underſtood, *thou art my Lord and my God*, i. e. I acknowledg thee to be truly that ſame Lord whom I before followed; and not a Man only, but to be alſo God, in as much as thou haſt overcome death, which keeps all men under its power:

power: which ſenſe exactly agrees with *Chriſt*'s words; *be not incredulous, but believing.* Chapter XXI.

Verſ. 29. Πεπιστευκας.] *Faith* is properly of thoſe things which are not ſeen; becauſe what we ſee, we are ſaid *to know*, not *to believe*: ſee *Heb.* xi. 1. But yet ſometimes any perſwaſion whatſoever is called *Faith*, even that which is built upon the teſtimony of the Senſes. Thus the Latin *credere* is taken in that Verſe of *Plautus*, Aſinar. Act. 1. Sc. 3. *Semper oculatæ manus ſunt noſtræ, credunt quod vident.*

Ibid. Καὶ πιστεύσαντες.] This ſeems to refer to the time future: *Bleſſed are thoſe who tho they will not ſee, yet ſhall believe.* And this is Faith properly called, whereby we aſſent to a thing upon ſolid reaſons, which we never ſaw, notwithſtanding the ſeeming ſtrangeneſs of it. Conſult Interpreters on *Heb.* xi. 1. and what I have ſaid concerning Faith, on *Gen.* xv. 6.

CHAP. XXI.

Verſ. 1. ΠΑΛΙΝ] *i. e.* in *Galilee*, or at the Lake of *Genneſareth*, as *Grotius* has obſerved; for at *Jeruſalem* he had appeared to his Diſciples before, more than once. This ought to have been expreſſed in the Paraphraſe.

Verſ. 5. Προσφάγιον] does not ſeem to ſignify in this place ὀψάριον, but that which being ſold might help to buy any ſort of ὀψάριον: for by what follows it appears that the Apoſtles had ὀψάριον already by them on the ſhore; and the end of their fiſhing was not ſo much to get fiſh for themſelves to eat, as to ſell that they might provide themſelves with other neceſſaries. As long as they followed *Chriſt*, they ſubſiſted by the ſame liberality of pious Women that he himſelf did; but at this time the Apoſtles not being yet in any repute, there ſeems to have been a ſtop put to that liberality. And therefore they had been forced to betake themſelves to their old trade of fiſhing again to get their *living*.

Verſ. 9. Ὀψάριον.] The *Doctor* in concurrence with *Grotius* and others ſuppoſes that theſe Fiſh were produced out of nothing, which yet is unneceſſary, conſidering that the Lake was very full of Fiſh, and that there was no body to ſee how they came upon the Coals; not to ſay that St. *John* gives no ground for ſuch a ſuppoſition.

Ibid. Ἐτόλμα.] Since the words *knowing that it was the Lord* follow, the Verb ἐτόλμα here cannot ſo properly ſignify *dared*, as *thought fit* or *adviſable*; no body judged it convenient to ask him who he was, perceiving it to be the Lord, tho they did not preſently know his face,

Chapter XXI.

which had a greater majesty in it than before. But yet St. *John* chose rather to say οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα ἐξετάσαι αὐτὸν, than οὐδεὶς ἐνόμιζεν ὅτι δεῖ ἐξετάσαι αὐτὸν, because the Disciples abstained from asking that question, not only because of the Tokens by which they knew him to be the Lord, but also out of fear, lest he should be displeased with them as incredulous. They knew indeed that it was the Lord, but their knowledg of it was not so certain as to make it perfectly needless to ask him; but yet they dared not do it.

Vers. 14. Τοῦτον.] I have already intimated that our Author in his Paraphrase does not clearly enough interpret this word. As therefore I have before interpreted the word πάλιν in *vers.* 1. with *Grotius*, of a *Place*, viz. *Galilee*; so in like manner I think that this τρίτον ought to be understood of a place. And indeed it can hardly be understood of the third day after the Resurrection, it being certain that on the day of the Resurrection it self, the Disciples tarried at *Jerusalem*, and incredible that the Apostles could be a fishing so soon as the third day after it; for it is at least two days journey from *Jerusalem* to the Lake of *Gennesareth*, especially on foot. But besides, this was not the sixth, but the seventh or eighth time, if we reckon right, that Christ appeared to his Disciples: Consult *Steph. Curcellæus Instit. Rel. Christ.* Lib. 5. c. 14. about this matter.

Vers. 15. *Note* b. I am apt to think that the immediate occasion of *Christ*'s question (for that there might be some remoter reasons of it I do not deny) was St. *Peter*'s over-hasty descent into the Sea, not being able to stay till the Ship came to Land. For as soon as ever he had notice given him by St. *John* that *Jesus* stood on the shore, he presently leaped into the water, impatient of delay; that he might, as soon as possible, come to the Lord, whilst the rest tarried in the Ship, till they could step out of it upon Land. This occasion St. *Peter* gave *Christ* to ask him whether he loved him more than the rest of his Disciples, because he came sooner to him than they.

Vers. 18. Ὅταν γηράσῃς.] *Grotius* here has this gloss: *When thou hast added almost forty years to those which thou hast lived already.* But out of what Chronology did he learn, that from the year of *Christ*'s death to the last of *Nero*, beyond which the death of St. *Peter* cannot be deferred, there was the space of forty years? From the year of *Christ* 33, in which he ascended into Heaven, to the 68*th* in which *Nero* died, there were only 35 years. And supposing St. *Peter* to have died *Anno Christi* 65, as the most exact Chronologers think, there will be fewer. I wonder that Dr. *Hammond* too should follow *Grotius* here, without any examination.

Vers

Verſ. 22. *Note* c. This *coming of Chriſt* is very well interpreted by Dr. *Hammond*, who deſerves to have almoſt all the glory of it. For few other Interpreters beſides him ever diſcerned the true meaning of it, and no body has ever ſo clearly explained it, or ſo copiouſly demonſtrated it. This opinion of his is confirmed by the Church of *Epheſus*, which in *verſ.* 24. declares the truth of St. *John*'s Teſtimony, both as to this and all other things. If the Chriſtians of that Age had believed the words ἕως ἔρχομαι to ſignify *till I come to judg the living and the dead*, as the Apoſtles had thought, they muſt have judged the teſtimony of St. *John* not be true; becauſe he was dead, and yet that laſt day was not come. Since therefore they thought St. *John* a faithful Witneſs, both of *Chriſt*'s Doctrin and Reſurrection, and knew that he was dead, they muſt have underſtood this *coming of Chriſt* in another ſenſe. And nothing happened in all that interval of time which could be called *Chriſt's coming*, but that remarkable Vengeance which he took upon the *Jews*. Chapter XXI.

Verſ. 24. *Note* d. How could the *Epheſians* ſay οἴδαμεν, *We know that his teſtimony is true?* namely, not only by thoſe evidences of veracity and prudence which they obſerved in St. *John* himſelf, but chiefly by his *Doctrin* and *Miracles*, the former being a holy Doctrin, and the latter *God*'s Seal to the truth of it.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS ON THE Acts of the Holy Apostles.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] It is much more probable that St. *Peter* died in the Reign of *Nero*, and that in the year of *Christ* 65. as *A. Pagus* has shewn in *Baron Epicr.* ad Ann. 67.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 13. *Note* d. I Have several Remarks to make on this Interpretation of Dr. *Hammond.*

I. That he recurred to this singular Interpretation, because he thought that these two Passages of St. *Luke* could hardly otherwise be reconciled. In the last Verse of his Gospel he has not said that the Apostles *were always in the Temple*, διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. And here he speaks, περὶ τὸ ὑπερῷον ἧ ἦσαν καταμένοντες, *of an upper room where they abode*, and pray'd to God. But the *Doctor* himself acknowledges that the Apostles were not in the Temple the whole day, but only at the stated times of publick Prayer: At other times therefore they were at their own Houses, in which I do not see why there could not be ὑπερῶα, into which they might retire in order to pray, or to spend their time with their Master, or in pious Discourses about him. And therefore this place may be very well understood thus; *where they abode* when they were not in the Temple, or hinder'd by other Affairs; where they were for the most part when they kept at home.

II. It is indeed very true, that there were several Chambers or Rooms in the Temple, which might be called so many ὑπερῶα, and the *Doctor* might have taken less pains in proving it; but he should have given us some Examples, to assure us that the common People, and especially Strangers, did not only pray in the Court of *Israel*, but went up also into the Chambers that lay over the Porches, in order to pray with the more secrecy. For it is not at all probable that the Apostles who

who were poor men, and *Galileans*, and odious for their Master's sake to the *Jews*, dared to do any thing which others could not in the Temple, in which they might have been taken notice of by the *Priests* and *Levites*. Our Author therefore ought to have shewn that it was the custom of pious Men to retire sometimes into the more secret Chambers of the Temple for their private Devotion, which I cannot tell whether any body can prove; at least I never met with any foot-step of that custom. Chapter I.

III. He perfectly forces the words in *Chap.* ii. 46. as I shall afterwards shew.

IV. *Epiphanius* doth not affirm that the ἱερὸν here spoken of was where the Temple had been, but in *Mount Sion*, upon which, as all know, was built the *Palace* or City of *David*, and not the *Temple*, which lay more towards the East and South, and stood upon another Hill, supposed to be *Mount Moriah*, and commonly called the *Mountain of the House*. He that does not know this, let him consult Dr. *Lightfoot* in *Cent. Chorograph.* premised before St. *Matthew*, Cap. xxii, xxiii, and xxvii. where, by Passages taken out of *Josephus* and the *Rabbins*, he puts this matter out of all doubt. It must be acknowledged however that *Epiphanius* by the inaccurate order of his words gave the *Doctor* an occasion to mistake: For he speaks thus; Εὗρε τὴν πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐδαφισμένην. καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπεπατημένον, παρεκτὸς ὀλίγων ἱματίων: *He found the whole City demolished, and the Temple of God trampled upon, except a few Houses.* The three last words the *Doctor* makes to refer to the *Temple*, when they ought to be referred to the *City*. It follows; καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας μικρᾶς οὔσης, ἔνθα ἀπελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτε ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἐλαιῶνος, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον. ἐκεῖ γὰρ ᾠκοδόμητο: *and the Church of God which was little, in the place to which the Disciples returning, when our Saviour was caught up from Mount* Olivet, *went up into the upper room, for there it was built.* This Church was not on the ground where the Temple stood, but in Mount *Sion*, as *Epiphanius* tells us in the next words: τυπίσαν ἐν τῷ μέρει Σιών, ἥτις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρημώσεως περιελείφθη, καὶ μέρος οἰκίσεων ἀπὸ αὐτὴν τὴν Σιών, καὶ ἑπτὰ Συναγωγαὶ, αἱ ἐν τῇ Σιὼν μόναι ἐστήκεισαν: *that is, in a part of* Sion *which was left undestroy'd, and some parts of the Houses that were about the same* Sion, *and seven Synagogues which stood alone in* Sion.

Vers. 15. *Note c.*] It is true indeed, that *the Name of God* in Scripture is often put for *God* himself, and that the Rabbins call God השם *the Name* with an Emphasis: But we never find it set to signify Men or *Persons* in the Old Testament. I am apt to think that it is rather a *Latinism* than a *Hebraism:* For in Latin Authors nothing is more common

Chapter II. common than for the word *Names* to be put for *Men* or *Persons*. So *Ovid.* Amor. Lib. 2. El. 1.

——— *Heroum clara valete*
Nomina

So Statius lib. 6. Thebaidos.

———*Quisnam iste duos, fidissima Phœbo*
Nomina, commisit Deus in discrimina Reges?

So Valerius Flaccus, *lib.* 4.

Nomen ait prædulce mihi, nomenque sequutus
Otreos;

That is, *Otreus*. See *vers.* 225. of the same Book, and *Lib.* 5. *vers.* 61. and 120.

Vers. 18. *Note* g.] See my Note on the parallel place in St. *Matthew*, and what I have said there in opposition to Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion.

Vers. 25. *Note* k.] If our Author's Interpretation were true, the *Conjunction* καὶ should have preceded the Verb πορευθῆναι. It will be very modestly said concerning *Judas* by the Apostles, that he went into his proper place, if by ἴδιον τόπον be meant that State, whatsoever it was, which he passed into after his Death. Such another Phrase *Plato* makes use of *in Phædone*; Ψυχὴ δὲ καθαρῶς καὶ μετρίως τὸν βίον διεξιοῦσα ——ἥκει εἰς τὸν αὐτῇ ὁμοίαν τόπον ἀφικνεῖται: *the Soul which has lived purely and soberly, dwells in a place suitable to it self.*

CHAP. II.

Vers. 17. *Note* b. *lin.* 49. After the *Cit.* out of *Deut.* xxxi. 29.] I have shewn in my Notes on *Deuteronomy*, that these words signify only in general, *after days*. If they signify *the days of the Messias*, the reason of that is because those days were *after-days*, or *days then to come*. Sometimes the Phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτου ἡμέρου signifies *the last days*, not of the *Messias*, but of those Writers that made use of it, *i. e.* the days just past, or that were near at hand. This may easily be applied to the places that Dr. *Hammond* alledges.

Vers. 46. Κατ' οἶκον] This is well translated by the *Vulgar*, *circa domos*, i. e. not in any one House, but sometimes in one and sometimes

times in another, for fear of being ſurprized by the *Jews*. I do not deny but that the word οἶκος may be ſet to ſignify a *Chamber* or *Room* in the Temple; but the Phraſe κατ' οἶκον can no more ſignify *in one of the Rooms of the Temple*, than κατὰ πόλιν *in Jeruſalem*, Chap. xv. 21. & xx. 23. *Tit.* i. 5. Who will ever believe that a vaſt multitude of Chriſtians did every day eat in the Chambers of the Temple? No body beſides Dr. *Hammond*. Chapter III.

Ibid. It is true indeed that the word χάρις ſignifies often a *Benefit*, as alſo the Latin *gratia*; but the Phraſe ἔχειν χάριν πρός τινα ſignifies only *to be in favor with him*, and not to give any thing to him. The caſe is plain. We muſt not enquire what words ſignify by themſelves, but in conjunction with one another. Our Author's arguing here is abſurd.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 19. *Note* a. *line* 15. AFter the words *utter ruin*.] Our learned Author's Memory here failed him. See my Notes on *Gen.* v. 29.

Verſ. 21. *Note* b.] This Interpretation which the *Doctor* here gives us of the words ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν δέξασθαι, is not, as he pretends, moſt agreeable to the Context, but a very harſh one; for it is manifeſt that what is here ſaid concerning *Chriſt*, viz. *that the Heaven muſt receive him*, is oppoſed to the foregoing words, *And he ſhall ſend Jeſus Chriſt which before was preached unto you*. St. *Peter* firſt exhorts the *Jews* to repent of their Sins, that they might obtain Mercy and Forgiveneſs when Chriſt ſhould come from Heaven, and then he adds, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν δέξασθαι, &c. i. e. *whom the Heaven muſt contain*, or who muſt continue in Heaven *until the times of the reſtitution of all things*. There could be no mention here made of *Chriſt*'s Government, or his having taken upon him the Government of Heaven, but only of his ſtaying in Heaven, which is the oppoſite to his returning from thence. Our Author out of a deſire to propoſe ſomething new, ſays ſometimes ſuch things as none that have any skill in this ſort of Learning can admit of.

Ibid. Ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων.] What the *Syriac* and *Chaldee* word was that St. *Peter* made uſe of I cannot tell. But St. *Luke* expreſſing his ſenſe, and meeting with a word proper to his purpoſe among the Stoicks, he uſed that. Thus *Numenius* in *Euſebius Præp. Evang.* lib. 15. cap. 19. ſetting down the Opinion of the *Stoicks* ſays, that after the Conflagration of the World, Nature ἀπολαβοῦσαν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον ῥηθὲν λόγον, ἢ εἰς τὴν ἀνάῤῥησιν ἐκείνην τὴν ποιοῦσαν ἑνιαυτὸν τὸ μέγιστον, καθ' ὃν αὐτῆς μόνης εἰς αὐτὴν γίνεται ἡ ἀποκατάστασις, *will return to its firſt, as it is called, Reaſon, and that*

Chapter IV. *Reſurrection which will make the great Year, in which year the reſtitution of it ſelf alone into the ſame will be brought about.* See *Lipſius de Phyſiol. Stoic.* lib. 2. c. 22. where there is a very remarkable Paſſage out of *Julius Firmicus* to this purpoſe.

Verſ. 24. *Note* c.] I wiſh our Author had given us the Reaſons which made him think that *Samuel* firſt of all inſtituted the Schools of the Prophets, for I confeſs I do not know how he could be certain of this. It is true, *Samuel* is deſcribed the firſt in the company of the Prophets, and going before them, 1 *Sam.* xix. 20. But it no where appears that he was the firſt Inſtitutor of ſuch Schools. I ſhould rather ſay that his Name is here put firſt, becauſe he was indeed the firſt famous Prophet, whoſe Predictions are extant, that ſucceeded *Moſes*.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 1. Στρατηγὸς τῦ ἱεροῦ.] This was not a Heathen, but a *Jew*, the Captain of the Levites, of which ſee my Note on *Luke* xxii. 44. The Prieſts did not uſe to walk ſo cloſe together with Heathens for fear of being polluted.

Verſ. 7. Ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει;] Did you do this by a *magical* Power, or a Power derived from the Devil, or from *God*? ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι; or by whoſe *authority*, ſince you had none from the *Sanhedrim*? In whoſe Name do you pretend to be ſent? That the *invocation* of any Name is here intended, I do not think.

Verſ. 12. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία.] This is rightly interpreted by the *Doctor* in his Paraphraſe, ſo as to make the ſenſe of St. *Peter's* words here to be, that *Jeſus* is the only Mediator by whom we can have acceſs or admiſſion to *God*, and that *God* has ſent no other; from which it is conſequent that thoſe muſt fall ſhort of Salvation, who rejecting him, betake themſelves to any other Mediator, as the *Jews* did who placed their Confidence in *Moſes*. But this is nothing at all to the Heathens, who have neither ever heard any thing of *Chriſt*, nor ever caſt him off to ſubſtitute any Mediator in his room. If *God* will think fit to pardon ſome of them who live the moſt agreeably to right Reaſon, and confer upon them ſome meaſure of Happineſs out of mere Grace and Mercy; do we think that *Chriſt* will intercede that he may not? Sure he will not; and I do not ſee why we ſilly Mortals ſhould ſet bounds to God's Mercy. But this belongs to the Theory of Divinity, which I have purpoſed not to meddle with.

Verſ. 28. Γενέσθαι] Δι' αὐτῶν muſt be underſtood. The meaning of the Apoſtles is, that God had before decreed not to hinder by his Wiſdom

Wiſdom and Power what he foreſaw would be done *by them*, unleſs his Wiſdom and Power interpoſed to hinder it. *Affirmatives*, as they call them, muſt be often expounded by *Negatives*. And ſo γενέσθαι here is all one as ὑ κωλύειν ἵνα μὴ γένηται, *not to hinder its being done*. See *Gen.* xii. 13. and my Notes on that place, as alſo on *Chap.* v. 3. of this Hiſtory. And whereas the Apoſtles ſay not only βουλὴ θεοῦ ἐστι, but alſo ἡ χεὶρ ου, when it is only the Counſel of God, to ſpeak properly, that *determins*, and his *Hand*, that is, his Power, which *executes* what he has decreed; the reaſon of that is, becauſe they would have it underſtood, that God did not want Power to have hinder'd this if he had pleaſed, but only he did not make uſe of it; which confirms the Negative Senſe I have given of the word γενέσθαι, *to be done*. Chapter V.

Verſ. 35. Καὶ ἐπῆλθεν, &c.] The Teſtimonies of Philoſophers, who thought all things ought to be common, and Examples likewiſe of ſome Nations which have reduced that into practice, have been collected by *Lucas Holſtenius* on the Life of *Pythagoras*, p. 82. Amongſt the reſt he ſets down theſe Verſes of *Scymnus*, an antient Geographer of *Chios*, concerning the *Nomades* in *Scythia* who dwelt beyond *Panticape*.

Ζῶσι δὲ τὴν τε κτῆσιν ἀναλλοτριοῦντες
Κοινὴν ἁπάντων, τύγχανει ἴλεω ὑσίαν.
Καὶ τὸν σοφὸν Ἀνάχαρσιν ἐκ τῶν Νομαδικῶν
Φασὶ γενέσθαι τῶν σφόδρα εὐσεβεστάτων.

They live in common upon what they all poſſeſs, every one receiving as much as he has need of from the publick Stock. And the wiſe Anacharſis, *they ſay, came of this very pious Nation of the* Nomades.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. Πωλήσας κτῆμα.] I cannot ſee any reaſon to ſuppoſe, as the *Doctor* does in his Paraphraſe, that *Ananias* and *Saphira* did this in purſuance of a Vow they had made to do it, *i. e.* to ſell their Eſtate. It is not neceſſary to add any thing to St. *Luke*'s Hiſtory. *Ananias* and *Saphira* hoped, that giving part of the Price to the Apoſtles, they ſhould enjoy the reſt themſelves, and at the ſame time have a maintenance allowed them out of the common Stock of the Church. In which they were guilty of a *double* Sin; *Firſt*, That tho they had no need of it, yet they would have the Church maintain them, and ſo rob thoſe that were really indigent: And, *ſecondly*, That to that end they told a Lie, by ſaying that they had brought the

Chapter V. whole Price for which they had ſold their Eſtate. That this is the true ſtate of the Caſe, the bare reading of St. *Luke*'s words will ſhew, in which there is nothing that implies theſe two Perſons to have been guilty of breaking any Vow.

Verſ. 2. Ἔθηκεν.] The Context ſhews, that in this place we muſt ſupply in our thoughts this Circumſtance; καὶ ἔλαττον τιμὴν τοῦ κτήματος ἤνεγκεν, *and ſaid that it was the whole Price of the Poſſeſſion.* See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, on the word *Circumſtantia:* Otherwiſe St. *Peter* could not have been angry with *Ananias*, or upbraided him with lying.

Verſ. 3. Διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσε.] Theſe words muſt be interpreted by a Negation, for St. *Peter*'s meaning is no more than this; *Why didſt not thou hinder Satan from filling thy mind?* i. e. Thou oughteſt to have hinder'd Satan from having ſo great a power over thee, as to perſwade thee to tell a Lie, *viz.* by begging *God*'s Grace to enable thee to reſiſt and overcome that Temptation. Of this way of interpreting an *Affirmation* by the help of a *Negation*, ſee my Note on *Chap.* iv. 28. The Verb πληροῦν here includes not only the Devil's tempting *Ananias*, but the noxious effect or prevalency of his Temptation: for when the Devil tempts a Man he does but as it were knock at the Door, without entring in; but when his Temptation prevails, being admitted, he fills his Mind, and caſts all thoughts of Virtue out of it. St. *Jerom*, not ſufficiently underſtanding the force of this Interrogation, or of the Verb πληροῦν, tranſlated it by *cur tentavit*, *Why hath he tempted?* *Beza* indeed ſuppoſes the reaſon of his rendering it ſo to have been, that he read the Greek ἐπείρασε, i. e. *tentavit*, *tempted.* But there are two things which make it probable, that he endeavour'd rather to expreſs the ſenſe of the place, or if he thought that it ought to be ſo read, that he relied only upon his own Conjecture, and not on any Copies. *Firſt*, All the Copies out of which any various readings have been taken, that ever I could meet with, read it as we do. *Secondly*, It is certain that the old Tranſlation before St. *Jerom*'s time, had *implevit*, *filled*; for ſo this place is alledged by S. *Cyprian* Teſtim. *Lib.* 3. *Sect.* 30.

Ibid. *Note* b.] The ſenſe which our Author prefers before the reſt, relies only on this ſuppoſition, which has been liked alſo by many others, that *Ananias* and *Sapphira* made a Vow, of which there is not the leaſt word ſaid by St. *Luke*. It will be much more natural to interpret the words ſo, as to underſtand ψεύδεσθαι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, to ſignify *to lie to the Holy Ghoſt*, ſpeaking by the Apoſtles, or *by lying to deceive him.* Conſult *H. Grotius*. If it be demanded why *Ananias* and *Sapphira*

Sapphira ſuffered ſo ſevere a Puniſhment for telling a Lie? the An- Chapter
ſwer is ready. There were three very important Reaſons why that V.
Severity ſhould be uſed. *Firſt*, Thoſe that acted in that manner, can hardly be ſuppoſed to have thought the Apoſtles to be *Prophets*, who could know Secrets by Revelation from God; which Opinion, if it had ſpread, would mightily have leſſened the Apoſtles *Authority*, and conſequently very much hindered the propagation of the Goſpel. If any ſhould doubt whether it were generally thought that Prophets could diſcern Secrets, he need only read *Luke* vii. 29. *Secondly*, It was for the intereſt of the Chriſtian Religion, that above all Crimes, diſſembling ſhould be moſt ſeverely puniſhed, none being more pernicious or of more fatal Conſequence, according to thoſe words of *Cicero de Offic.* Lib. 1. c. 3. *Totius injuſtitiæ nulla capitalior eſt, quam eorum qui cum maxime fallunt, id agunt ut viri boni eſſe videantur. Of all Crimes there is none more heinous and capital than theirs, who whilſt they deceive moſt, endeavour to appear honeſt Men. Thirdly*, It was alſo of very great concernment, that thoſe who firſt joined themſelves to the Apoſtles, ſhould not be hypocritical Perſons, that made a ſhew of Piety, when they had none, becauſe the Sins of ſuch Perſons would have diſcredited the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf, among thoſe to whom it had not been yet preached. Eſpecially, if it had been commonly reported, that Men that were ſlothful or covetous had joined themſelves to the Chriſtians; becauſe all that brought a little Mony to the Apoſtles, pretending it to be their whole Eſtate, were maintained at the publick Charge: as this would have been a great Reproach to Chriſtianity, ſo it would have induced a great many lewd People to feign themſelves Chriſtians, that they might abuſe the Churches Liberality, as it frequently, I believe, happened in ſucceeding Ages, when the Poſſeſſions of the Chriſtians were enlarged: Of which we have a famous Example in one *Peregrinus* mentioned by *Lucian*.

Verſ. 4. *Note* c. There is no difficulty at all in this place, if we do but lay aſide the thoughts of a *Vow*, about which St. *Luke* is perfectly ſilent. The ſenſe will be very natural and commodious, if we underſtand the Apoſtle thus: "Who compelled thee to ſell thy Eſtate? "Would it not have continued thy own if thou hadſt not ſold it? "But thou wert reſolved to ſell it. And couldſt thou not have kept "all the money which thou hadſt for it after it was ſold? Who re"quired any part of it from thee? Thou mighteſt have kept it all to "thy ſelf, and no body would have complained; but thou oughteſt "not to come with a lie to thoſe that are Prophets, and inſpired by

"the

Chapter V. " the Holy Ghoſt, and feign thy ſelf to have brought the whole Sum, " that thou mighteſt be maintained by the publick Liberality; as if " thou hadſt left thy ſelf nothing at all, and made thy ſelf as indigent " as the pooreſt. The word κτῆσις never ſignifies an *immoveable Eſtate*; that is nothing but our learned Author's own invention.

Verſ. 13. Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι.] The word λοιποὶ here does not ſignify thoſe that believed and heartily embraced the Goſpel, but rather *Hypocrites* or Diſſemblers; who would in vaſt numbers have joined themſelves to the Church, if the Apoſtles could have been impoſed on. This *Grotius* perceived, whom our Author ought to have followed in this, as he ordinarily does in other things. The Apoſtles were not ſolicitous *how many* profeſſed the Chriſtian Faith; but how *good* and *ſincere* they were in that profeſſion, leſt by the evil practices of its Profeſſors, the Chriſtian Religion, when it was but in its riſe, ſhould be diſhonoured; which would have been a thing of very bad conſequence, as I have already obſerved.

Verſ. 24. Στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ] *i. e.* The Captain of the Gariſon of *Levites*, as I have ſhewn on *Luke* xxii. 52. And hence *verſ.* 26. St. *Luke* calls thoſe that he had under his command, not στρατιώτας *Souldiers*, but ὑπηρέτας *Miniſters* or *Officers*, viz. of the Levitical Tribe, who according to the direction of the Law, obeyed the Prieſts that had the overſight of the Temple.

Verſ. 33. *Note* f. If our learned *Author* had look'd a little further into *Heſychius*, he would have underſtood what was the proper ſignification of this word: For thus that learned Grammarian interprets the word διεπρίοντο: Διεπρίοντο, ἐδυμῶντο, ἔτριζον τοὺς ὀδόντας, *They were angry, they gnaſhed with their teeth.* Which *Phavorinus*, as he uſes to do, has tranſcribed.

Verſ. 41. *Note* k. It is true, among the *Romans* ſcourging was a ſervil puniſhment, becauſe it was not lawful to ſcourge any *Roman* Citizen; but it was not among the *Jews*, tho thoſe upon whom it was inflicted, ὑπεμάζοντο, *were alſo reproachfully uſed.* And St. *Luke* makes uſe of that word rather than ἐκολάζοντο, becauſe the *reproachful uſage* ἀτιμία of the Apoſtles, was worſe than their puniſhment κόλασις: See the *Doctor* on *Luke* xxiii. 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Chapter VI.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THE words τὰ Ἑλλήνων φρονῶν, in the place alledged by the *Doctor* out of *Phavorinus*, are not well tranſlated by him *to have skill in the Greek learning*, but ought to be rendered *to be on the Greeks ſide*, or *of the ſentiments of the Greeks*. And hence the learned *Iſ. Voſſius*, *De Sybillinis Oraculis*, Cap. 16. affirms thoſe to be miſtaken who interpret the word ἑλληνισὶς as Dr. *Hammond* does, becauſe ἑλληνίζειν does not only ſignify to imitate the Language of the *Greeks*, but alſo to ſide with the *Greeks*, as φρυγίζειν, περσίζειν, μηδίζειν, ἀντιγονίζειν, ſignify to imitate the Manners or Cuſtoms, or be of the ſide of the *Romans*, *Perſians*, *Medes*, or *Antigonus*, or any who howſoever countenance them. *For it is certain*, ſaith he, *that the Jews were divided into two parties: Thoſe that were for the Rites and Cuſtoms of their Country, bore the Grecian and Roman yoke*, &c. *impatiently. But thoſe that were of a more peaceable temper, and exhorted the reſt to bear with patience the yoke which God had laid upon them, were ſaid to be on the Grecians ſide, and upon that account were called* ἑλληνισταὶ and φιλέλληνες. But notwithſtanding this, it is poſſible that ſome of the *Jews* might have this name of *Helleniſts* given them merely becauſe they underſtood Greek, and others becauſe beſides that, they were more favourable to the Greeks than the οἱ βαθεῖς *profound Hebrews*, and imitated in ſome meaſure their manners; nor do I ſee how either of theſe can be denied obſtinately. But thoſe, I think, are guilty of a miſtake, who make a diſtinct language of that which was uſed by the *Helleniſts*, and call it the *Helleniſtical Tongue*; whereas it ſeems only to have been the Language of thoſe who could ſpeak nothing well but Hebrew, and ſpake Greek very ill; ſuch as were thoſe who tranſlated the Old Teſtament into that Language, and likewiſe the Apoſtles and others who had learned to ſpeak Greek in *Judæa*. But this was rather a corruption of the Greek Tongue, by mixing it with Hebraiſms, than a diſtinct Language or Dialect, as *Salmaſius* and others have ſhewn at large.

CHAP. VII.

Chapter VII.

Verſ. 3. Ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς σε.] TWICE *Abraham* received ſuch a command as this from *God*; firſt when he was in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, from whence he ſet out with his *Father*, and went to *Charran*, as we are told by *Moſes*, Gen. xi. 31. and here by St.

Chapter VII.

St. *Stephen*; and then afterwards at *Charran*, where he left his Father, of which *Moſes* gives us alſo an account, *Gen.*xii.1. Unleſs we diſtinguiſh theſe, we ſhall hardly make *Moſes* agree with St. *Stephen*, or he conſiſtent with himſelf: See my Notes on *Gen.* xii. 1.

Verſ. 4. Μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.] If this diſcourſe of St. *Stephen* were not extant, and the ſacred Chronology were taken only out of *Moſes*, every thing in *Moſes* would be plain; for *Abraham* would be underſtood to have began his Journey whilſt *Terah* was alive, as I have ſhewn on *Gen.* xii. 4. But becauſe St. *Stephen* here ſays that *Abraham* departed from *Charran after his Father's death*; therefore the Moſaical Chronology is otherwiſe digeſted, and *Abraham* is reckoned to have gone into *Canaan* ſixty years later. But if we examin the matter more throughly, it will ſeem much more probable that St. *Stephen* ſpake according to the account generally received in that Age, in which there might have been a miſtake, than that he was *inſpired* by the *Holy Ghoſt* to ſpeak as he did, becauſe it ſignified very little whether the year of *Abraham*'s departure were exactly known; and the force of St. *Stephen*'s reaſoning, or the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, did not at all depend upon that Chronology. And I ſuppoſe the reaſon of this miſtake in the common account of the Jews, *viz.* that *Abraham* ſet out from *Charran* not till after his Father was dead, was becauſe *Moſes* in *Gen.* xi. made mention of the death of *Terah* before he ſpake of *Abraham*'s departure. And it is no wonder that the *Jews*, who took little or no care to improve in any ſort of Learning, were ſo miſtaken in matters of Chronology, and overlooked thoſe things which later Writers on *Gen.* xii. 1. have obſerved. Juſt ſuch another Error I have taken notice of in *Joſephus*, on *Gen.* xxv. 20.

Thoſe who correct the Moſaical Chronology by St. *Stephen*'s diſcourſe, of which number is *Lud. Cappellus*, think that *Abraham* was born, not in the *ſixtieth*, but in the *hundred and thirtieth* year of *Terah*'s Age. But if this were ſo, why did *Abraham* think it ſo ſtrange that a man of a hundred years of Age ſhould be able to get Children, when he himſelf had been begotten by his Father when he was thirty years older? See *Gen.*xvii.17. But then they on the other hand, ask us whether it is likely that *Terah*, who accompanied *Abraham* out of *Ur*, ſhould rather chuſe to ſtay five and ſixty years at *Charran*, than go to *Abraham*? Why not, ſince he had his Son *Nachor* there with him, who had a numerous Family? But at leaſt, ſay they, after the miraculous birth of *Iſaac*, he ſhould have gone to *Abraham*. This cannot according to them be any ſuch great Miracle, and their inference from it is weak: For *Terah* might have a great many reaſons for his ſtaying at *Charran*, more than we know of.

Verſ.

Verſ. 14. *Note* g. *Col.* 2. *lin.* 12. after the words, *Jacob's going into Egypt.*] Our learned Author is miſtaken: See my Notes on *Gen.* xxviii. 1. Chapter VIII.

Verſ. 51. *Note* i. See my Notes on *Exod.* xxxii. 9.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 32. *Note* g. *Grotius* juſtly rejects the Opinion of *Beza*, who thought that the word περικοπὴ was made out of the Hebrew פרשה, tho there be no great difference between them, either in ſound or ſignification. Nor is Dr. *Hammond*'s Conjecture any thing more probable, which relies upon the ſame grounds with that of *Beza*. *Grotius* has ſhewn out of *Cicero*, that περικοπὴ is a genuine Greek word which ſignifies *periodus*, *a Period*. For it comes from the Verb περικόπτω, *to contain* or *comprehend*, which is uſed by St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* ii. 6. where, citing a place of Scripture, he ſays, περικεῖται ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, *it is contained in the Scripture*. I confeſs περικοπὴ has other ſignifications belonging to it; but amongſt thoſe ſignifications there is one that has a near affinity with this. So in the *Old Gloſſes*: περικοπὴ βιβλίου *argumentum*, περικοπὴ βασιλείας *argumentum*, περικοπὴ *continentia*, περικοπῆς *tenore*, leg. *tenoris*; all which ſignify what may be otherwiſe barbarouſly called in Latin *contentum*, in French *le contenu*, *the Contents*.

Verſ. 33. *Note* g. If St. *Luke* ſpake Hebrew, there is no doubt but that he cited the words of *Iſaiah* as they are in the *Hebrew*; and that therefore his meaning is to be underſtood by the ſignification of the *Hebrew* words. But the *Septuagint* do not differ much from the ſenſe of the *Hebrew*, if their words be but rightly pointed, thus: ἐν ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ, ἤρθη, *in his humility was his judgment, he was taken away*: That is, Chriſt appearing to be a perſon of a mean and low condition, the *Jews* and *Pilate* paſſed judgment on him as an inconſiderable contemptible man, who ought to be put to death to prevent any Seditions being made upon his account: And ſo in effect he was by *Pilate*'s order. The words in the Hebrew are to be rendered thus: *By reaſon of force and puniſhment he was taken away*, or *by reaſon of reſtraint and puniſhment*; for the Verb עצר ſignifies both *to force* and *to reſtrain*. The Prophet's meaning is, that *Chriſt* ſuffered that puniſhment of death, by reaſon the *Jews* hindered *Pilate* to paſs an equitable judgment upon him, or forced him, as it were, to condemn him. It appears by the paraphraſe on *verſ.* 35. that Dr. *Hammond* was of *Grotius*'s opinion, or one very near it; for he thought that this Prophecy was literally fulfilled

Chapter IX. filled not long after *Iſaiah*'s time: I wiſh he had ſpoken more plainly. It is not, as the *Doctor* tells us, the word עצר *botſer* in the Hebrew, but עצרה *batſarah* that is render'd σύνοδος; but they may, I confeſs, be uſed promiſcuouſly, and therefore I will not quarrel with him about that.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 31. *Note* d. THE 9th Similitude in the 3d Book of *Herma*'s Paſtor is worth our reading upon this Subject.

CHAP. X.

Chapter X. THE Hebrew word alledged by our Author, ſignifies *Incenſe* or *Perfume*, not *an Offering*: See my Notes on *Levit.* ii. 4.

Verſ. 25. Ως δε ἐγένετο εἰσελθεῖν ὁ Πέτρος.] The *Cambridg* Copy, which was formerly *Beza*'s, reads this Paſſage thus; συναντᾷ ζοντος δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ εἰς Καισάρειαν, συμβαλὼν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν διεσάφησεν αὐτῷ, ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐπισκόπους καὶ συναντίους αὐτῷ ποιῶν ἔρχ, &c. It is manifeſtly a Paraphraſe on St. *Luke*'s words, and not a various reading taken out of any antient Copy; for the Greek is purer, and the ſtile more natural and fluent than is uſual in the New Teſtament Writers. There are in this Book a great many Paſſages paraphraſed by the Author of that Copy: See *Chap.* xi. 1, 2, 26. and xiii. 44. and xiv. 1. and xxiii. by which places it will evidently appear, that the Writer of that *Manuſcript*, being more skilful than St. *Luke* in the Greek Language, has every now and then changed the Phraſe to make the conſtruction more elegant. Thoſe who affirm theſe, notwithſtanding the contrariety of them to all the other Copies, and the agreement of the moſt Antient Fathers with thoſe Copies, to be various readings, and that too older than any in our Copies, were certainly never any great maſters of Criticks.

CHAP. XI.

Chapter XI. Verſ. 30. *Note* b. COL. 1. lin. *ult.* after the *Cit.* out of *Deut.* xxxi. 28.] Our Author would have ſaid what was more likely, if he had told us that old Men ſignified Magiſtrates, becauſe publick Truſts were generally committed to aged Perſons, upon the account of their great experience, and the Government which they have over their Paſſions above the younger ſort.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Chapter XII.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. YEA, and which is more than that, it ſignifies to *do* a thing, for in *Gen.* iii. 22. by *putting forth the hand and taking*, we are to underſtand *taking*, and not merely an attempt to take.

Ibid. Ἔξιμον αὐτὸν ἀναιρεῖν ἀνόμους] There never really happened any thing that was wonderful almoſt, but fanciful Men have feigned ſomething or other like it. So *Ovid. Metam.* Lib. 4. *Fab.* 10. ſpeaking of one *Acætas* who had been caſt into Priſon by *Pentheus*, upon *Bacchus*'s account, and was afterwards releaſed, ſays that,

Sponte ſua, patuiſſe fores, lapſaſque lacertis,
Sponte ſua, fama eſt, nullo ſolvente, catenas.

It was the common report that the [Priſon] *doors opened of their own accord, and the Chains fell off from his hands of themſelves, no body looſing them.*

Verſ. 13. *Note* d. Tho the Verb προακούσαι often ſignifies *to anſwer one that calls*, as *Stephanus*, before Dr. *Hammond*, had obſerved, and proved at large in his *Theſaurus*; yet when the Diſcourſe is about one whoſe buſineſs it is to keep a Gate, it ſignifies the ſame as in Latin *ſubauſcultare*, i. e. to hearken from within ſide to the Voice of them that knock, in order to know who they are: For the Porter or Portreſs uſed to ask who it was that knocked before ever they opened the Door, and to hearken to the Voice to ſee if they knew the Perſon: At Night eſpecially this was requiſite, leſt they ſhould let in Thieves inſtead of Friends. See *Stephanus* and *Pricæus* on this place, and there will be no room to doubt but that *Eraſmus* has righteſt of all tranſlated this Verb, by *ſubauſcultare*.

CHAP. XIII.

Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 10. *Note* d. IT is *ill ſuppoſed* by the *Doctor*, that the words laſt-cited by him out of *Heſychius*, are to be read without a *comma*; for the Greeks do never, after the Engliſh manner, heap up three *Adjectives* without any *Conjunction*, or *Noun Subſtantive*, no not the Poets themſelves; in which if there be two that ſeem to meet together, one of them ſtands for a *Subſtantive*, as *Euſtathius* has obſerved on *Iliad.* r. *Ed. Rom.* p. 427. Ἄνανδρος, ſaith he, ὃ ἀμὲ

Chapter XIII.

δύο ἐπίθετα, πολλῷ δ' ἧττον ἐπὶ τρία κεῖται, χωρὶς κυρίου ἢ προσηγορικοῦ: *for there are never two, and much less three Epithets put together, without some Noun proper or appellative.* The same learned *Grammarian* in his Notes on *Odyss.* Δ. p. 1506. explains the words ῥαδιεργὸς & ῥαδιεργία thus; ῥαδ. ὀργὸς καθ' Ἥλιον Διονύσιον, ὁ κακοεργὸς, καὶ ῥαδιεργία, φησὶν, ἡ περὶ πᾶν ὀλιγωρία καὶ ἀφροντίς: *the first, according to* Ælius Dionysius, *signifies mischievous or wicked, and the latter,* saith he, *carelessness and confidence about all things.* But there is no signification which will better suite this place, where the discourse is about a Magician, than that which we meet with in the *Old Glosses*, where ῥαδιεργία is rendered by *falsum* a *cheat* or *falsehood*, and ῥαδιεργὸς *falsarius*, *a falsifier* or *deceiver*; for it is well known that a Magician is for the most part but another name for an Impostor. *Dionysius Halicarnass.* Lib. 1. *Antiq. Rom.* p. 63 and 64. uses the words ῥαδιούργημα & ῥαδιουργεῖν, speaking of some false Miracles by which a certain lover of the Female Sex was supposed to have deceived a simple young Girl.

Vers. 15. *Note* e. That it was the Office of an *Archisynagogus* to appoint one to read in the Synagogue, as St. *Luke* here teaches us, the *Jews* also said. See *Camp. Vitringa* in *Synag. Veteri*, Lib. 3. P. 1. c. 9.

Vers. 31. That *Christ* by his Resurrection received as it were a new birth, and so was begotten of God, might be properly enough said also according to the way of speaking usual among the Greeks; as appears by *Hesychius* on the word Διυπετὲς πτῶμα: ὃ καὶ πεσὸν, saith he, ὑστερόπτυμον, ὅπου δὲ ἔλεγον ὁπόταν τινὶ ὡς πιθανῶν τὰ νομιζόμενα ἐγένετο, καὶ ὕστερον ἀνιέρευν ζῶν.——ἢ ὁ φυσικὸς ὃν ξένης πατρίδος, ἔπειτα ἐπανελθών, ἢ ὃν διὰ γυναικὸς κόλπου διαδὺς ὡς ἔθος ἦν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ἐκ δευτέρου γενόμενος: *which is the same with the* ὑστερόπτυμον *of others, applied to a Person who having had the funeral Rites performed for him, as for one that was dead, afterwards appeared alive* ——— *or who after he was reported to have died in a foreign Country returned again, or one who had again passed from between his Mother's Breasts, as the custom was among the* Athenians, *was said to be born* or *begotten again.*

Vers. 48. *Note* m. It is a true Observation of the *Doctor*, that the word τεταγμένος is used by a Metaphor taken from military Affairs, to signify that course of Life to which we are called by God. Thus it is used by *Socrates*, in his *Apology*, extant in *Plato*, whose words for brevity sake shall be set down only in English. *In whatever place a Person either puts himself* (ἑαυτὸν τάξῃ) *thinking that to be the best, or is put by his Commander,* (ὑπὸ ἄρχοντος ταχθῇ) *in that, in my judgment, he ought to abide and face danger, fearing neither death nor any thing else more than baseness. Really,* O Athenians, *I should be guilty of a very great*

great fault, if when the Captains choſen by you to be my Commanders, had placed me (τάττων) at Potidæa, at Amphipolis, or at Delius, I then kept the poſt in which they had ſet me, and underwent the danger of Death; and yet when God, as I thought, has ſet me (τάττει θεὸς) and I have determined with my ſelf to ſpend my Life in Philoſophizing —— there fearing Death or any other thing, I ſhould forſake my rank, τάξιν. So likewiſe Epictetus in Enchirid. c. 29. τὰ δοκοῦντα σοι βέλτιστα εἶναι φαινόμενα ἴσχε, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμένου: Thoſe things thou accounteſt beſt, adhere to, as if placed by God in ſuch a Station. Chapter XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

Verſ. 17. Οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον ἑαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν] *i. e.* God did not ſo entirely conceal himſelf from the Heathens, as to give them no evidences at all of his Providence; for every thing in nature was a ſtanding witneſs of God's Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs. Nor were the Heathens altogether deaf to this voice of Nature, as appears by many of their ſayings which learned Men have collected on this place, to which I ſhall here add theſe remarkable words out of *Cicero*, Tuſcul. Lib. 1. *Hic autem*, ſaith he, *ubi habitamus, non intermittit ſuo tempore:*

Cœlum miteſcere, arbores frondeſcere,
Vites lætificæ pampinis pubeſcere,
Rami baccarum ubertate incurveſcere,
Segetes largiri fruges, florere omnia,
Fontes ſcatere, herbis prata conveſtirier.

Tum multitudinem pecudum, partim ad veſcendum, partim ad vehendum, partim ad corpora veſtienda, hominemque ipſum quaſi contemplatorem cœli ac Deorum, ipſorumque cultorem, atque hominis utilitati agros omnes & maria patentia. Hæc igitur & alia innumerabilia cum cernimus, poſſumuſne dubitare, quin his præſit aliquis aut effector, ſi hæc nata ſunt, ut Platoni videtur; vel ſi ſemper fuerint, ut Ariſtoteli placet, moderator tanti operis & muneris? And here on this Earth on which we dwell, the Sky *does not ceaſe* to grow calm, nor the Trees in their proper ſeaſon to ſhoot forth Branches, nor the Vines to bud and bring their reviving Fruit to perfection, nor the Boughs to hang down with ripe Berries, nor the Corn to yield its expected increaſe; but all things flouriſh, the Springs are conſtantly running, and the Fields are clothed with Graſs. *And then if we conſider what a multitude there is of Cattel, partly for Food, partly for carrying, and partly for clothing*

Chapter XVI. *clothing our Bodies, and the nature of Man it self, who seems to be formed for contemplating Heaven and the Gods, and to adore and worship them, and that the whole Earth and Sea lies open for his use: When we see, I say, and consider these and innumerable other things, can we doubt whether there is a superior Being, who is either the Creator of these things, if they were indeed created, as* Plato *thinks; or if they always were, as* Aristotle *supposes, who is the manager and disposer of so great a work and charge?*

Vers. 23. *Note* b. P. 394. *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 42. after the words *used of the Apostles*] If we add what Mr. *Selden* has observed, concerning the word χειροτονῶν, *in Syned. Hebræorum*, Lib. 1. c. 14. to what is here said of it by Dr. *Hammond*, there will be nothing material left for us to know, either about the various significations of that word, or about that particular signification of it for simple *constituting*, which Mr. *Selden*, as well as Dr. *Hammond*, has shewn to belong to it, in this place. You may add if you please, the Testimony of *Cicero* about the Decrees of the Greeks, *Orat. pro Flacco* Cap. 6. *Sunt expressa illa præclara quæ recitantur psephismata, non sententiis, neque auctoritatibus declarata, nec jurejurando constricta, sed porrigenda manu, profundendoque clamore multitudinis concitatæ. Those excellent Decrees which are recited* (among them) *are expressed, not declared by Opinions or Authorities, or ratified by Oaths, but by the stretching out of the Hand, and the loud cries of the heated Multitude.* By this it appears what χειροτονῶν properly signifies, but it is metaphorically applied to signify any *constitution*, or, as Ecclesiastical Writers speak, *ordination*, as those learned Men thought, and have at large proved.

CHAP. XVI.

Vers. 13. *Note* a. I Cannot imagin what took up our Author's Thoughts, when he said that the *Neapolis* here mentioned in *vers.* 11. was the same with that in *Epiphanius*; for St. *Luke* speaks of a City in *Macedonia*, which was situated upon the Gulph of *Strymon*; and *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 80. which is that of the *Massalians*, of the City *Sichem*, in the middle of *Palestine*. But the greatest Men do sometimes commit mistakes through forgetfulness or want of care. Of *Proseuchæ*, *Oratories or places for Prayer*, consult at leisure the Collections of *St. le Moine Var. Sac.* p. 74. & seqq.

Vers. 16. *Note* b. 1. What our Author here says about the word *Python*, as a name of the City *Delphos*, he took out of *Grotius*, as he often does other things. If you would see more of that matter, consult *Luc. Holstenius* ad *Stephanum Byzantinum*. For my own part I do

do not think that *the Spirit of Python* here has any thing common to it with the City *Delphos*, or with *Apollo*, beſides the name. That name of the City *Delphos* was grown quite out of date, before ever the word *Python* was in uſe in this ſenſe; nor would the Greeks upon that account have called a divining Spirit *Python*, or the *Spirit of Python*. *Apollo* himſelf was not called in Greek Πυθὼν, but Πύθιος. But in the *Phœnician* Language, as in the Hebrew, פות *photh*, or perhaps פתון *phython*, was uſed to ſignify a Womans Privy-parts: See *Iſa.* 3. 17. And hence a Propheteſs, out of whoſe Privy-parts the voice proceeded or ſeemed to come, might be called in that Language נחש פתון *a Propheteſs by Phython*, i. e. one that propheſied out of her Privy-parts; of which kind ſhe that firſt of all reſided at *Delphos* ſeems to have been, who having been killed by *Apollo*, gave occaſion to that Fable about the killing of the *Serpent Python*, becauſe the *Phœnician* word נחש *nahhaſch* ſignifies both a *Serpent* and a *Prophet*, and פתון *Phython* was looked upon as a proper Name. Afterwards by a word borrowed from the *Tyrians* or *Sidonians*, the ἐγγαστρίμυθοι were called *Pythons*, or ſuch as had the Spirit of *Python*; for this word having grown out of uſe among the Greeks, was afterwards brought in again, as *Plutarch* affirms, who is cited by *Grotius* to that purpoſe. And hence the Antients always interpret Πύθωνα by ἐγγαστρίμυθον, and attribute this kind of Divination chiefly to Women. Beſides the Paſſages alledged by *Grotius*, add this out of *Heſychius*; Πύθων ὁ ἐγγαστρίμυθος, ἢ ἐγγαστρίμαντις, ἢ βυζάντιος τὸ γένος: *a Man or Woman that ſpeaks or propheſies out of the Belly, or a Byzantian by Birth.* Read ἢ ῥήτωρ, &c. *an Orator who was a Byzantian by Birth*, of whom ſee *Suidas*. Πύθων, *δαιμόνιον μάντικον, a divining Spirit* or *Devil.*

Chapter XVII.

2. The Hebrew אוב *ob* does not ſignify the *Belly* but the *Womb*: It is rendered indeed by the *Septuagint* ἐγγαστρίμυθος, but not rightly, as I have ſhewn in my Notes on *Levit.* it being rather to be rendered μαντεῖαι.

CHAP. XVII.

Verſ. 11. Εὐγενέστεροι.] *Beza* has rightly obſerved, that there is a compariſon here made between the Jews of *Theſſalonica* and thoſe of *Beræa*; and that by this Word εὐγενέστεροι we are to underſtand an extraordinary excellency of temper in the *Beræans*, which was not in thoſe of *Theſſalonica*. Thus the Philoſophers thought a Perſon had need of εὐγένεια to make him deſpiſe pleaſure, and ſet himſelf to the ſtudy of *Philoſophy*. *Zeno* in his Epiſtle

to

Chapter XVII.

to *Antigonus*, extant in *Diogenes Laertius*, Lib. 8. Sect. 8. has these words: ὁ γὰρ φιλοσοφίας ὀρεγόμενος, ἀκλινον ἔχ τὴν πολυθρύλλητον ἡδονὴν, ἣ πάνυ πολλὰς νέων ψυχὰς, φαίνεσ εἶ ὁ μόνον φύσει σεῖς δίγενεσι κλίνων, ἀλλὰ ἐ προαιρέσει: *For having a great desire to become a Philosopher, and shunning that pleasure which is so much cried up, and which effeminates the minds of some young men, thou manifestly shewest thy self enclined to generosity, not only by nature but by choice.* Φύσις ἔ δίγενὴς μιλείκε ἀσκήσει σεμλαβέσα, ἔτι τι τ ἀρδίνα διδάξασα, ῥᾳδίως ἔρχεται σεῖς τὴν τελείαν ἀνάληψιν τ ἀρετῆς: *And a generous disposition with a little exercise, and a good Master, easily attains to the perfection of Virtue.* The *Bereans* are as certain and noble an example of this as any that can be given. The word δίγενεια signifies *properly* nobility of Birth or Descent; but it is metaphorically used to signify greatness of Mind. *Seneca* likewise interprets the Latin *generosus* thus, *Epist.* 44. *Quis generosus?* saith he, *Ad virtutem bene à natura compositus: Who is a generous man? He that is by nature well disposed and formed for virtue.* *Plato*, or as others think, *Speusippus* in his *Definitions* tells us that Ευγένεια is ἀρετὴ δίγενες ἕξις. Εὐαγωγία ψυχῆς σεῖς λόγυ, ἢ σεῖξιν: *The virtue of a generous disposition, a pliableness of mind to good thoughts and actions.*

Vers. 19. *Note* e. Long before I had read what the *Doctor* here says, or had any thoughts of interpreting the New Testament, the etymology of the word Ἀρεόπαγος seemed suspicious to me; because I had observed that the silly Greeks do often very unhappily pretend to discover the originals of old Names in their Language, and afterwards endeavour to confirm those Etymologies by feigned Stories, as might be made appear by a hundred instances. And therefore searching a little further back, it came into my mind that it was a reproach formerly cast upon the *Athenians*, that they came from *Ionia* into *Attica*, and were called Ἴαονες by *Homer*; of which see *Bochart* in *Phaleg.* Lib. 3. c. 3. And I knew otherwise that the Language of the *Pelasgi*, the most antient Inhabitants of *Greece*, was a barbarous Language, and unknown to those that came after them, as the Glory of *Great Britain* Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Origines Sacræ* has shewn. And hence I made no great difficulty to infer that the *Iaones* and *Pelasgi* were the Posterity of *Javan* or *Jon*, יון, who spake that Language which they had brought with them out of the East, *i. e.* the Hebrew, or one very like it. Now in that Language הר פגע *Har-pega* signifies *a Mountain of violence*, or *incursion*, or also of *slaughter*; whence it may be conjectured, that that Hill was by the first Inhabitants of *Attica* so called, because of some slaughter or fight that had happened in that place; of which some footstep remained in the story about the slaying of *Halyrrothius Neptune's*

Neptune's Son, mentioned by Dr. *Hammond*, and which may be read in those Authors which he alledges. Ἄρης also the name of *Mars*, is a *Hebrew* word, for הרי or הררי signifies a *Mountaineer*, as *Mars* was, who is said to have had his aboad in the Mountains of *Thrace*, and was made the God of War, because, as those that live in mountainous places generally are, he was a valiant Man, and had made himself famous in War. *Athens* also had its name, as the Greeks say, from Ἀθήνη an Epithet of *Pallas*, which is the same with the Hebrew אֵיתָן *ethan*, i. e. *valiant*. And *Pallas* is feigned to have been the Goddess of War in the same manner as *Mars*; and seems to have been some *Amazon* or warlike Woman that ruled over *Attica* in those fabulous times. She is called also the *Goddess of Wisdom*; and this seems to be intimated by the name Πάλλας, if that be derived from the Hebrew פָּלַס *palas*, i. e. *directed, considered, examined*; from whence comes the Noun פֶּלֶס *peles*, which signifies *Justice*, Prov. xvi. 11. But these things do not belong to this place. Chapter XVII.

Vers. 22. *Note* f. *Col.* 2. *lin.* 32. after the words, *move for it.*] One that had never read *Plutarch*'s Treatise περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, and should take strict notice of Dr. *Hammond*'s words, would easily perswade himself, that what he produces as out of *Plutarch*, were taken out of that Author himself; but they are not.

1. What he alledges as out of the Life of *Alexander*, is in the forementioned little Treatise περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, p. 170. F. *Edit. Francofurtensis*, Ann. 1599. which is the Edition that I have, and is set down thus: ὡς οὕτως θεὸς εἶναι ὁ ἄθεος, ὁ δὲ δεισιδαίμων ὑβρίστης.

2. An ingenious thought of *Plutarch*'s is manifestly perverted by him, which is in the last lines of the foregoing Page, and the beginning of that which I have mentioned. *Plutarch* affirms that superstitious people are worse than Atheists; and he subjoins: ἥκιστα ἂν ἐθέλοιμι μᾶλλον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις λέγειν περὶ ἐμοῦ, μήτε γεγονέναι παῤ ἐμοὶ, μηδ' εἶναι τὸν Πλούταρχον, ἢ λέγειν ὅτι Πλούταρχός ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ἀλίκαυος, ὑμαπάθεια, δίχολος, ὀξὺς ὀργὴν, ἐπὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσι πικρότατος, μικρόψυχος: *I had rather, for my part, that men should say of me, that there never was, nor is any such man as* Plutarch, *than say that* Plutarch *is an inconstant, changeable man, one that is easily provoked to anger, greedy of revenge upon every slight provocation, and melancholy upon the least adversity that befals him.*

3. The whole passage about the *Jews*, which is also in *p.* 169. is not set down by him intire; for *Plutarch* justly derides their Superstition, who sat still on the Sabbath and let their Enemies scale the walls of the City, without making the least opposition against them, but *lay all tied and bound by their Superstition as in one net.* However, this is not a

Chapter XVIII.

common practice with our learned Author, to cite the Teſtimonies of the Antients upon the Authority of others.

Verſ. 23. *Note* g. The place referred to by the *Doctor* in *Pauſanias* is nothing to the purpoſe; for *Pauſanias* does not ſay that the *Lydians* ſacrificed to a *God* which they did not *themſelves know*, but which was unknown to *him*. It is in *pag.* 391. *Edit. Hanov.* Ann. 1613. where ſpeaking of a *Magus*, he ſays that ἐπίκλησιν ὅτε δὴ θεῶν ἑκάστῳ βάξειεν, ἢ ἀλλοῖς σπανίᾳ Ἕλλησι: *He ſang an Invocation to any of the Gods in a barbarous Language, impoſſible for the Greeks to underſtand.* Beſides, our Author miſrepreſents *Pauſanias* as ſaying *the Lydians and Perſians*, whereas his words are, Λυδὸς ἐπίκλησιν Περσικὸς, *The Lydians ſirnamed Perſian.* If you would ſee more Teſtimonies about the *unknown God* of the *Athenians*, conſult *Meurſius de Piræco*, cap. 10.

Ibid. The *Doctor* ſhould have added the name of the Poet, or the place where he took thoſe Verſes, for there will be ſome that may ſuſpect them to be made by ſome Chriſtian. This paſſage of St. *Paul* may be illuſtrated by the words of *Apuleius* in Lib. de mundo: *Vetus opinio eſt, atque cogitationes omnium hominum penitus inſedit, Deum eſſe originis, & haberi auctorem; Deumque ipſum ſalutem eſſe & perſeverantiam earum, quas effecerit, rerum. Neque ulla eſt tam præſtantibus viribus, quæ viduata Dei auxilio, ſui natura contenta ſit. Hanc opinionem vates ſequuti profiteri auſi ſunt*, omnia Jove plena eſſe; *cujus præſentiam, non jam cogitatio ſola, ſed oculi & aures, & ſenſibilis ſubſtantia comprehendit. It is an antient opinion, which has poſſeſſed the minds of all men; that God is, and is accounted the Author of the World; and that God himſelf is the ſafety and perſeverance of thoſe things which he has made: And that there is nothing of ſo great ſtrength, as to be ſelf-ſufficient, and not to ſtand in need of God's aſſiſtance. And this opinion the Poets having eſpouſed, have not ſtuck to ſay*, that all things were full of God; *whoſe preſence it ſeems not our minds only, but alſo our eyes and ears and every ſenſible ſubſtance comprehends.* He had a reſpect to the ſame paſſage of *Aratus* as St. *Paul*.

CHAP. XVIII.

Verſ. 22. *Note* c. OUR learned Author is miſtaken, when he ſays that *Cæſarea Philippi* was not far from that *Cæſarea* which was alſo called *Turris Stratonis*, between which there was the diſtance of two days journey, which is a great deal in a little Country: See the Maps of *Judea*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Verſ. 33. *Note* g. I Had rather interpret the word προβάλλειν with the *Vulgar* by *propellere to puſh forward*, or to carry along to Judgment; for it did not belong to the *Jews* to queſtion any man, but only to the Judges. So this word is taken, in that excellent ſaying of *Solon* in *Plutarch*: Τῶν πόλεων εὐνομεῖται μάλιστα, ἐν αἷς τοῖς μὴ ἀδικουμένοις προβάλλονται καὶ κολάζουσι τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας: *That City is extremely well governed, in which thoſe that are not injured, as well as thoſe that are, carry ſuch as do any injury to judgment, and puniſh them.*

Verſ. 35. *Note* i. The title of Νεωκόρος is common in the Coins of the Cities of *Aſia*; but *Epheſus* gloried in it above the reſt. For there are ſome pieces of *Epheſian* Money to be ſeen at this day, in which *Epheſus* is not only *ſimply* ſtiled Νεωκόρος, or *twice* Νεωκόρος, but there is alſo a piece coined under the reign of *Caracalla* inſcribed ΕΦΕCΙΩΝ ΤΡΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ; and another under *Heliogabalus*, ΜΟΝΩΝ ΑΠΑCΩΝ ΤΕΤΡΑΚΙC ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ, in which they boaſt that *they only of all* the Cities of *Aſia had been four times* Νεωκόροι. See *J. Foy-Vaillant* in *Num. Aer. Impp.* coined in Colonies and Corporations, T. 2. *pag.* 171.

CHAP. XX.

Verſ. 28. ΔΙΑ τ. αἵματος τ. ἰδίου.] In the *Alexandrian* Copy the word *ἰδίου* is omitted, as the *Oxford Edition* of the New Teſtament obſerves. I wonder that Dr. *Hammond*, who often ſets down the various readings of that Copy, ſhould take no notice of this. It is obſervable alſo, that inſtead of τ. θεοῦ many Copies read τ. κυρίου, and ſome κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ. And ſuch variations as theſe are common in the places heretofore controverted, in the time of the *Nicene* Synod.

CHAP. XXI.

Verſ. 7. *Note* a. THE Vulgar reading is certainly right, and ought not to be changed; for no body beſides the *Doctor* ever uſed διανύειν πλοῦν as a Greek phraſe for *ſailing*; but διανύειν πλοῦν, as διανύειν ὁδὸν is very properly made uſe of to ſignify the finiſhing of a Voyage. The meaning of St. *Luke* is clear: *Having finiſhed our Navigation from* Tyre, *we came to* Ptolemais; for they had firſt finiſhed their Navigation before they came to *Ptolemais*, from whence

Chapter XXII. whence they went on foot to *Cæsarea*. Whether a *Comma* be put between διανύσαντες and ἀπὸ, or whether it be omitted, the thing is the same, for διανύσαντες is to be connected with κατηντήσαμεν, *having finished*, or *made an end of our Navigation, we arrived.*

CHAP. XXII.

Verſ. 11. Ὁ ΤΚ ἐνίσλαπον ἀπὸ τ δόξης.] *God* did ſometimes ſhew himſelf to Perſons, encompaſſed with ſo dazling a light, as even blinded the lookers on. And hence that ſaying of *Hagar* in *Gen.* xvi. 13. where ſee my Notes, as alſo what I have written on *Exod.* xxxiv. 18, 20.

Verſ. 25. *Note* c. *lin.* 24. after the word *ſuch an one?*] 1. Our Author's memory failed him, when he ſaid, *So ſaith* Philo *of* Agrippa, *&c.* for what is there ſaid, is ſpoken by *Agrippa* of *Caligula*, in *Philo de Leg. ad Caium*, p. 798. *Edit. Genev. Philo* produces a Letter of *Agrippa* to *Caius*, in which *Agrippa* writes to him thus: φίλων ἰνίων πατρίδας ὅλας ἃ Ρωμαίκης ἠξίωσας πολιτείας. And it is certain *that* could only be done by the *Emperor* at that time, and not by *Agrippa*, as every one knows. He ſhould have ſaid therefore: *So ſaith* Agrippa *of* Caligula *in* Philo.

2. It is ſtrange our Author ſhould produce a paſſage, as out of the 47*th* Book of *Diodorus Siculus*, who wrote only 40, as *Photius* affirms *Cod.* 70. of which we have only half extant and ſome fragments. But he meant *Dion Cocceianus*, whoſe words thoſe are in *Lib.* 47. p. 228. Edit. Græc. *Rob. Stephani.* Beſides, thoſe words of *Dion.* ὅτι ὁ Ἰουλιόπολιν σφᾶς ἀπ' αὐτῦ μετονομάσαι, ought not to be tranſlated, *that from his own name he call'd them* Juliopolis, but *that they changed their name and called themſelves from him*, Juliopolis. For it was a piece of flattery in the Inhabitants of *Tarſus*, who afterwards alſo out of flattery to other Emperors, called their City *Adriana*, *Antoniniana*, and *Severiana:* Of which ſee *Luc. Holſtenius* on *Stephanus Byzantinus.* The words of *Dion* are no proof at all that *Tarſus* had the freedom of the City of *Rome* given to it; and it otherwiſe appears, that after *Auguſtus*'s time that was *a free City*, which was govern'd not by the *Roman* Laws but by its *own*, and therefore did not enjoy the privileges of the City of *Rome:* Conſult on this place *H. Grotius*, whom the *Doctor* would have more ſafely followed, as being not ſo well acquainted with antient Hiſtory. Perhaps St. *Paul* had been made a *Roman* Citizen, becauſe his Father, tho a Jew, had been made free of *Rome*; ſuch as *Philo* ſpeaks of in the place quoted by the *Doctor* in the next Annotation.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Verſ. 5. Οὐκ ᾔδειν ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεύς.] St. *Paul* ſeems at that time to have looked another way, ſo as not to have obſerved who it was that had commanded him to be ſmitten. So that we muſt ſupply out of what goes before, the words; ὃς ἐπέταξε πατάσσειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα, *who had ordered him to be ſmitten on the mouth.* There is nothing more natural than this; others ſeek a knot in a bulruſh.

CHAP. XXIV.

Verſ. 1. Ἐνεφάνισαν] The *Doctor* has hit the true ſenſe of this word in his Paraphraſe, but only, as he now and then does, he borrows terms from the preſent cuſtom to expreſs it by, which he ſhould not have done, becauſe at that time thoſe who had an accuſation againſt any, did not uſe to bring in the heads of it to the Proconſuls in writing, but only to *ſpeak* what they had to ſay. However Ἐμφανίζειν is not *comparere to appear* or *come before*, as it is rendered by *Beza*, but *to accuſe, to lay open a Crime*, as it is explained by *Suidas*, ἐμφανίζω σοι, φανερῶ σοι, with whom agrees *Phavorinus*, who interprets it by φανερῶς σοι δείκνυμι, *I ſhew it you manifeſtly.* It comes from φανὸς, as *Pricæus* upon this place has well obſerved; and φανὸς, according to *Ariſtophanes's Scholiaſt* on *Equites*, is ὁ κλαψύλλων, ἢ φανερῶς ποιῶν τὰ πεπραγμένα, ἢ μηνύων, *an accuſer, and one that lays open cauſes, and an informer.* And the *Old Gloſſes* have ἐμφανίζω *allego, intimo, to alledg, to intimate:* ἐμφανίζειν *declarare, to declare:* ἐμφάνεια *intimatio, an intimation.*

Verſ. 25. *Note* a. We may apply thoſe Verſes of *Juvenal*, Sat. 13. even to the Heathen Judges of that lewd and wicked Age.

——*Prima eſt hæc ultio, quod ſe*
Judice nemo nocens abſolvitur, &c.
——*hos tu*
Evaſiſſe putas, quos diri conſcia facti
Mens habet attonitos, & ſurdo verbere cædit
Occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum?

Ver. 27. Χάριτας καταθέσθαι] *i.e.* To pleaſe or gratify the *Jews*, leſt they ſhould ſend Informers to *Rome*, and complain of his lewd actions to *Nero*; or *elſe* that he might appeaſe and ſilence in ſome meaſure the *Jews* com-

Chapter XXV.

Complaints. The Governors of the Provinces used to be particularly cautious how they offended any, just before their departure, as we may perceive by the Counsel given by *Cicero* in his first excellent Epistle *ad Quintum fratrem: Tanquam Poetæ boni, & Actores industrii solent; sic tu in extrema parte & conclusione muneris diligentissimus sis. As good Poets and industrious Actors use to be; so be you very careful in the last part and conclusion of your Office.*

And yet for all this *Felix* could not avoid making himself Enemies, for the chief Men among the *Jews* went to *Rome* in order to accuse him; and he had certainly been punished, but that *Nero* was prevail'd upon by his Brother *Pallas*, whom he had an extraordinary love for at that time, to pardon him, as *Josephus*, lib. 20. c. 7. informs us.

CHAP. XXV.

Vers. 12. Μετὰ τῦ Συμβελίυ.] That is, with a Council of his own Friends, such as the Presidents of Provinces used to have with them, as *Grotius* has well observed; by not following of whom in such matters as these, our Author sometimes falls into Mistakes. So in *Josephus* Ant. Jud. lib. 14. cap. 17. *Julius Cæsar* himself begins an Edict in favour of the Jews thus; *I* Julius Cæsar, *made again Emperor and High-priest,* μετὰ συμβελίυ γνώμης ἐπίκεινα, *have decreed with the advice of my Council.* It is absurd to represent a Roman President, before he passes Judgment, conferring with the Accusers at the Judgment-seat, and especially when he could not gratify them. See *Grotius.*

Vers. 23. *Note* b.] Instead of *Dio*, where the *Doctor* alledges the words of *Laertius*, read *Bio*; for those words of *Laertius* are in the Life of *Bio Borysthenites*, Lib. 4. Sect. 53. *Ed. Amstel.*

CHAP. XXVI.

Chapter XXVI.

Vers. 18. Ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμὸς.] That is, *to teach them*, as the *Doctor* rightly paraphrases it. See my Notes on *Gen.* xxi. 18.

Vers. 23. Εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός.] *Verbatim*, that *the Messias was passible.* Examples of this signification of the *Particle* εἰ have been given by *Budæus* out of *Demosthenes*, Comment. *L. Gr.* p. 978. And so the Hebrew כִּי *chi*, which for the most part signifies ὅτι, is often used for *si, if*; see *Chr. Noldius* num. 24. and אִם *im*, which is *si if*, signifies also *quòd that*, Gen. xxxi. 52.

Vers.

Verſ. 28. Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι.] This is certainly an *Irony*, and ſhould have been explain'd as ſuch by our *Author* in his Paraphraſe; for it is ſufficiently known that *Agrippa* never became a *Chriſtian*. Chapter XXVII.

CHAP. XXVII.

Verſ. 2. Ἀδραμυττηνῷ.] *Grotius* thinks with St. *Jerom*, that it is *Adramyttum*, a City of *Africa*, that is here intended: But I am rather of *Beza* and Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion, who ſuppoſe it to be *Adramyttium* a Town in *Myſia*, for two reaſons. *Firſt*, Becauſe St. *Luke* ſays that *they were to ſail by the Coaſts of* Aſia; and a Ship in its return out of *Paleſtine* to *Adramyttium*, could not avoid coaſting *Aſia*, as any one that does but look into the Maps will plainly ſee. And, *ſecondly*, Becauſe it ſeems to have been the *Centurion*'s Reſolution to go into that part of *Aſia*, and croſs over from thence to *Thrace* or *Macedonia*, the Paſſage being but ſhort and much frequented: And then from *Thrace* or *Macedonia* to *Epirus*, and ſo into *Italy*. It is certain this was the ſafeſt way, becauſe of the uncertainty of the Wind. And this ſeems alſo to be the reaſon why *Ariſtarchus* the *Macedonian* travell'd in the ſame Ship, becauſe accompanying St. *Paul*, he ſhould have an opportunity of paſſing through his own Country.

Verſ. 6. Πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρῖνον.] *viz.* Which in its courſe to *Italy* had been driven by a violent South-wind on the Coaſt of *Lycia*. The *Centurion* ſeems to have alter'd his firſt Reſolution upon this occaſion, becauſe perhaps he thought he ſhould be at leſs charges if he ſailed directly to *Italy*.

Verſ. 7. Κνίδον.] This *Grotius* interprets of *an Iſland that lay over againſt* Caria, *and was famous for the Image and Worſhip of* Venus. And *Cnidus* indeed properly was a Town ſituated in a *Peninſula*, but there was before that *Peninſula* a little Iſland which the *Cnidians* poſſeſſed; and which, as *Strabo* ſpeaks, *lib.* 14. *διέπλεον τοῦτον πρὸ τῆς Κνίδου* [ἀπίους] *divided in a ſort* Cnidus *into two Cities*.

Verſ. 14. Εὐρακύλων.] For ſo the word ought to be read, and not Εὐρακλύδων, as *Grotius* has ſhewn, to whoſe Reaſons add this; that whilſt that Wind blew, the Mariners were afraid of falling into the Quick-ſands, *viz.* one of the *African Syrtes*, which was called ſimply *Syrtis* ἐξοχήν. For with ſuch a Wind one might ſail directly from *Crete* thither. The letter Α might eaſily be changed into Δ, and the Greek Tranſcribers underſtanding well enough the word κλύδων, which is in

Engliſh

Chapter XXVIII. English a *Storm*, but not the word Ἀκύλων, which is *Latin*, it is no wonder they mistook and writ Εὐροκλύδων.

Vers. 15. Ἀντοφθαλμεῖν.] For in order to sail into *Italy* it was necessary they should have a contrary Wind, which blew from that quarter of the Heaven that is between the *South* and the *East*.

Vers. 23. Θεὸς ᾧ εἰμι.] *Subintell.* δοῦλος, which word signifies not only a *Worshipper*, but a *Minister* or *Servant*, as appears by the Inscriptions of St. *Paul*'s Epistles.

Vers. 39. Ἔχοντα αἰγιαλὸν.] The word αἰγιαλὸς here does not signify any ordinary shore, for there is no Gulph or Bay but has some shore; but a *sandy* or *gravelly* shore, as it is interpreted by *Hesychius*; Αἰγιαλὸς, saith he, ὁ περιθαλάσσιος, ἐν τύπῳ ψαμμώδης, ἢ ψηφίδας ἔχων. And it appears that this shore was ψαμμώδης *sandy* by the 41*st* Verse.

Vers. 44. Ἐπί τινων ἢ διὸ τὸ πλοῖον.] The words ἀπορρίψαντας [ἑαυτοὺς] εἰς γῆν ἐξέναι ἐκέλευσεν in the foregoing Verse, must be here repeated, *and he commanded the rest to get to Land, some on boards and some on broken pieces of the Ship*, i. e. to take pieces of wood to bear themselves up with. The *Vulgar* absurdly renders it *& ceteros alios in tabulis ferebant*, as if those that could swim, had carried the rest to land upon Planks.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Vers. 3. Ἔχιδνα ἐκ τῆς θέρμης, &c.] This place has been largely handled by the learned *Bochart* in *Hieroz.* Part. 2. Lib. 3. c. 2. But I wonder so diligent a Man, as well as *Steph. Curcellæus in Parallelis*, should overlook that Passage in the Prophet *Amos*, Chap. v. 19. where, speaking of wicked Men who endeavoured in vain to escape the Justice of God which pursued them, as the *Maltees* thought St. *Paul* did, he says, *The day of the Lord is darkness and not light. As if a Man did flee from a Lion, and a Bear met him; or went into a house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a Serpent bit him.*

Vers. 4. *Note* b.] Ἡ Δίκη is the proper Name of a *Goddess*, which was look'd upon by the Heathens as the Revenger of Wickedness, and was otherwise stiled *Nemesis*. So saith *Suidas*, Νέμεσις, μέμψις, δίκη, *Accusation, Justice*. There is a notable Description given of her in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, lib. 14. cap. 11. which I shall here set down, that the reason of this Speech of the *Maltees* may be the better understood. After he had spoken of the Punishments which some wicked Men had suffered for their evil Practices, he proceeds thus:

Hæc

Hæc & hujuſmodi quædam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, &c. Chapter XXVIII.
Theſe and innumerable other ſuch things the Revenger of wicked and villanous Actions, and the Rewarder of thoſe that are good, Adraſtia, *many times effects, (and I wiſh ſhe always did) whom we otherwiſe call* Nemeſis. *Some ſublime Power of an irreſiſtible Deity, plac'd, as Men ſuppoſe, upon the Circle of the Moon; or as others define it, a ſubſtantial Guardianſhip preſiding with a general Power over particular Fates: Which the antient Divines feigning to be the Daughter of Juſtice, from ſome hidden Eternity, affirm to inſpect all Affairs here on Earth. She, as the great Miſtreſs on whom the deciſion of all Cauſes depends, and the Diſpoſer and Determiner of Chances, varying the courſes of Lots by turns, and many times giving our Actions a different iſſue than it ſeemed at firſt they would have, works a manifold change in the Purpoſes and Acts of our Will. And by an indiſſoluble chain of neceſſity tying up the Haughtineſs of Mortals, vainly puffing themſelves up, and (as ſhe underſtands how) turning and winding about the Junctures of thriving and decaying in the World, one while ſhe treads upon the Necks of the proud and inſolent, and quite diſpirits them; and another while ſhe raiſes the good from a low and mean to a happy and proſperous condition. The fabulous Antients feigned her to have Wings, that by her extraordinary ſwiftneſs ſhe might be thought preſent with every one, and repreſented her as holding a Rudder, and ſtanding over a Wheel, that ſhe might be underſtood to ſteer and govern the Univerſe by running over all the Elements.* On which words ſee *Valeſius* and *Lindenbrochius*.

Verſ. 15. *Note* e.] To confirm what is ſaid by *Joſ. Scaliger*, our Author might have alledg'd the Teſtimony of *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who ſeems to have been the Writer out of whom he learned it, and who in *Lib.* 16. *cap.* 11. has theſe words: *Converſus hinc Julianus ad reparandas Tres Tabernas, munimentum ita cognominatum, haud ita dudum obſtinatione ſubverſum hoſtili quo ædificato, conſtabat ad intima Galliarum, ut conſueverant, adire Germanos arceri. From hence* Julian *went and repaired the* Tres Tabernæ, *a Fortreſs ſo called, that not long before had been ruined by the Stubborneſs of the Enemy; which being rebuilt, he retired into the innermoſt parts of* Gallia, *and ſtayed there, in order to hinder the Incurſions which the Germans uſed to make into the Country.* And the *Tabernæ* having been ſo called, becauſe they conſiſted of *Tabulæ*, *Boards* or *Planks*; it is probable that there were little Houſes built there with Boards for the Souldiers to lodg in, becauſe they could not endure to abide always in the Camp.

Chapter XXVIII.

Verſ. 20. Τῆς ἐλπίδος τῆς Ἰσραὴλ.] Both by this place and what we find ſaid in *Chap.* xxii. 6. and xxiv. 15. and xxvi. 6, 7. it ſeems probable that St. *Paul*'s chief Adverſaries and Accuſers were not the *Phariſees* but the *Sadducees*; who were moſt of all offended with his ſaying that *Chriſt* had been raiſed from the Dead, and lived with God in Heaven; becauſe they denied the Reſurrection. And ſo beſides the hatred common to them with the *Phariſees*, there was this peculiar reaſon of their cruelty towards the Chriſtians. It's true, there is no mention made of this, either in the Accuſation brought againſt St. *Paul*, or in any other part of St. *Luke*'s Hiſtory relating to that matter; but from the defence which St. *Paul* makes for himſelf, this may be collected, who here mentions a circumſtance which St. *Luke* left out in its proper place; and that is no rare thing in the Hiſtory of the Scripture. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, on the word *Circumſtantia*, and Note on *Verſ.* 5. This is better I think than to ſay, as ſome others do, that it was a ſtratagem made uſe of by the Apoſtle *Paul*, to feign himſelf accuſed for aſſerting the Reſurrection of the Dead, when the queſtion was about ſomething elſe, that he might get the *Phariſees* to be more favourable to him.

Verſ. 21. Τῶν ἀδελφῶν.] Our Author did not ſufficiently mind who the Perſons were that ſpake this, when he interpreted the word ἀδελφοὶ *Brethren* by *Chriſtian* Jews: For it is clear that they were *unbelieving* Jews whom theſe Perſons (who were alſo themſelves ſuch) called *Brethren*.

Verſ. 22. Περὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως ταύτης.] It cannot from the foregoing words be inferred, that St. *Paul* was a favourer τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν χριστιανῶν, or *of the Chriſtian Religion*; and theſe *Jews* having no knowledg of him any other way, they could hardly have made this anſwer, if he had ſaid nothing but what St. *Luke* here relates. But St. *Luke* has not ſet down all the Circumſtances or particulars of St. *Paul*'s Diſcourſe, but only the principal part of it, and ſo it cannot ſeem ſtrange if it be inferred from what follows, that there was ſomething done or ſaid which in the foregoing Context is omitted, *viz.* that St. *Paul* did declare himſelf to believe that *God* had raiſed *Chriſt* from the dead, or that ſome others had affirmed this of him. See on *Verſ.* 20.

Verſ. 23. Οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἔκ τε τοῦ νόμου, &c.] Theſe words are diſplaced, and for the better underſtanding of them, are to be read in this order: οἷς ἐξετίθετο τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς ἔκ τε τοῦ νόμου, &c.] *to whom he expounded thoſe things which concerned Jeſus, bearing Teſtimony to the Kingdom of God, and perſwading them both out of the Law*

Law of Moſes, and out of the Prophets. I know very well that there are a great many inſtances to be found of the miſplacing of words in the very beſt Greek Writers, and particularly in *Ariſtotle*, as *Iſ. Caſaubon* in his Notes on *Theophraſtus*'s Characters *c.* 7. περὶ λαλίας has obſerved. But ſuch tranſpoſitions ſounding very harſh in Latin, and much more to thoſe who underſtand only the Modern Languages; this here in St. *Luke* ought not to have been retained by Interpreters, becauſe tho the thing is plain to one that is skilled in the Greek, yet it makes the ſenſe very obſcure to others. Tranſlators ought no more to imitate the Original in ſuch things, than the peculiar conſtruction of the Greek Language, which it is impoſſible without altering to turn into other Languages. For the clearer perceiving of which I ſhall here ſet down the words of a few Verſions of this Paſſage. The *Vulgar* has, *Exponebat teſtificans regnum Dei, ſuadenſque eis de Jeſu, ex lege Moyſis*, &c. What is *exponebat teſtificans?* Beſides, *de Jeſu* does not expreſs the ſenſe of the words τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, which ought to have been rendered *quæ pertinent ad Jeſum, thoſe things which concern Jeſus.* But yet *Eraſmus* ſo tranſlates them, omitting the article τὰ as ſuperfluous. And *Caſtellio* was guilty of the ſame fault, who otherwiſe uſes to recede, when there is no reaſon for it, from the Phraſe of the Sacred Writers: for thus he renders the words, *quibus ille diſſerebat, divinum regnum teſtificans, & eis de Jeſu ex Moſis lege perſuadere conans*; which is neither *Latin*, nor expreſſes St. *Luke*'s ſenſe. *Beza*'s tranſlation is a great deal better, *cum atteſtatione exponebat regnum Dei, ſuadens eis quæ de Jeſu Chriſto ſunt ex lege*, &c. but he did not obſerve there was a tranſpoſition here, nor come up to the ſenſe of every word. The not underſtanding of this, was the occaſion of the *Geneva* and other French Interpreters miſtranſlating this Paſſage. The *Geneva* renders it, *auſquels il expliquoit par divers temoignages le Royaume de Dieu, & les induiſit à croire ce qui concerne Jeſus*, &c. as if St. *Luke* had ſaid διὰ πολλῶν μαρτυρίων ἐξηγεῖτο. The *Port-Royal* has, *il leur prêchoit le Royaume de Dieu, leur confirmant ce qu' il leur diſoit, par pluſieurs témoignages*, &c. which is taking too great a liberty, whereas they ſhould have ſaid, *il leur racontoit ce qui concerne Jeſus, rendant temoignage au Royaume de Dieu, & les perſuadant par la Loi*, &c. Chapter XXVIII.

In the *firſt* place, the Verb ἐκτίθεσθαι does not ſignify to *interpret*, but to *relate* or *declare*, when the Diſcourſe is about matters of Fact, ſuch as the coming of *Chriſt*, his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Heaven. *Secondly*, the words τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ſignify the Hiſtory of *Jeſus*, by which he was underſtood to be the *Meſſias*. *Thirdly*, διαμαρτύρεσθαι is to bear Teſtimony to the truth of any Hiſtory, as the Apoſtles did,

Chapter XXVIII. when they teſtified that *Jeſus* was riſen from the Dead and gone up to Heaven; upon which account they are called his μάρτυρες *Witneſſes*: See *Acts* i. 8, 22. and x. 39, 41. St. *Paul* indeed was not capable of bearing the ſame Teſtimony to *Chriſt* as the reſt of the Apoſtles, who declared that they had ſeen him dead, and a little after alive again, and had heard and touched him, &c. But he was able to teſtify that he was ſtill alive, which he knew by what had happened to him in his way to *Damaſcus*, Acts ix. See alſo *Chap.* xxii. 15. And thus we find the word διαμαρτύρεσθαι uſed in *Chap.* x. 42. of this Hiſtory; *He commanded us to preach unto the People, and to teſtify* διαμαρτύρεσθαι, *that it is he which is ordained of God to be the Judg of the living and the dead*, viz. by giving account of what had happened to him, and of his Doctrin. St. *Paul* bore Teſtimony in a peculiar manner to the Kingdom of *God*, when he declared that *Chriſt* reigned in Heaven, and had been ſeen by himſelf ſurrounded with immortal Light and Glory. Of the tranſpoſing of words there is another plain inſtance in *Chap.* i. 2. of this Book.

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

Epiſtle of S. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Romans*.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] Tho moſt of what our Author ſays in this Premonition be true, yet there are two things in him liable to reprehenſion; and thoſe are, *firſt*, that he ſuppoſes many times the Apoſtle to have a reſpect to the *Gnoſticks*, where the *Heathens* or *Jews* are thought to be ſpoken of by other Interpreters, and that with more probability, as will appear by thoſe places, and eſpecially by *Chap.* i, and ii. The *ſecond* relates to his *Paraphraſe*, which is many times intricate and obſcure, full of Repetitions, harſh and forced, and in a word not ſufficiently adapted to explain the Series of St. *Paul*'s Diſcourſe; tho as to the main, he ſeldom miſſes the true ſcope of it. But no body will ever explain an obſcure Epiſtle, without endeavouring perſpicuity and brevity; which two things our Author's Paraphraſe is extremely defective in.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 4. ΤΟΥ ὡρισθέντος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, &c.] This paſſage S. *Auſtin*, *de Prædeſt. Sanct.* c. 15. ſays, may be ſo almoſt underſtood as the Unitarians commonly underſtand it. *Prædeſtinatus eſt ergo*, ſaith he, *Jeſus, ut qui futurus erat ſecundum carnem filius David, eſſet tamen in virtute filius Dei, ſecundum Spiritum ſanctificationis; quia natus eſt de Spiritu Sancto, ex Virgine Maria. Jeſus therefore was predeſtinated, as one who was to be according to the fleſh the Son of David, and yet ſhould be in Power the Son of God, according to the Spirit of Sanctification; becauſe he was born of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Ghoſt.* But the following words ἐξ ἀναστάσεως, muſt have a different ſenſe put upon them, which I take to be this; *viz.* that *the Holy Ghoſt*, which Jeſus had received, was as it were a Voice whereby it was *miraculouſly* [ἐν δυνάμει] *ſignified* or *declared* that he ſhould be *the Son of God, after his reſurrection* from the dead, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. He was the Son

Chapter I. Son of *God* it's true, not only in decree as the Schoolmen ſpeak, but actually before his Reſurrection; but he was again called the Son of God in a peculiar manner after his Reſurrection, as appears from *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. And therefore in this reſpect he might be ſaid, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ὁρισθεὶς υἱὸς θεοῦ, to be *ordained by the Holy Ghoſt* [to be] *the Son of God*, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως *after his Reſurrection*. This ſame Verb is uſed by St. *Peter* in *Acts* x. 42. in a like matter, where having ſaid that he and the reſt of the Apoſtles *had eaten and drank with Jeſus after he was riſen from the dead*, he adds: *And he commanded us to preach to the people, and to teſtify that it is he which was* ὡρισμένος *ordained by God to be the Judg of the living and dead.* As by the Holy Ghoſt which deſcended upon him, he was *ordained* or *marked out* by *God* to perform the Office of the *Meſſias*, and ſo to riſe again, and upon that account to be called the Son of *God*, beſides other reaſons, for which he has that title, by a ſpecial Right and Privilege given to him; ſo alſo by his being raiſed from the dead, he was *ordained* or *marked out* by *God* to be the Judg of the living and dead. That ὁρίζειν & προορίζειν here are the ſame, is truly obſerved by *Grotius*, who yet interprets the ſenſe of this paſſage ſomewhat confuſedly. Add to the Examples and Authors by him alledged, the Authority of the *Old Gloſſes*, in which ὡρισμένον ἡμέρα is rendered *ſtatuta dies, an appointed day*; and ὡρισμένος *præſtituto, foreordained* or *appointed*. And that the Prepoſition ἐκ ſignifies ſometimes *after*, appears from *John* xiii. 4. and 2 *Pet.* ii. 8.

Verſ. 7. Οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ.] He does not ſay Ῥωμαίοις, becauſe the greateſt part of thoſe who profeſſed the Chriſtian Religion in *Rome* at that time, were not *Roman Citizens*, but *Jews*, and people of other Nations who lived at *Rome* upon the account of Commerce. This has been imitated by *Clemens Romanus*, and *Polycarpus Smyrnenſis*, in the inſcriptions of their Epiſtles; on which ſee the Notes of learned Men.

Verſ. 8. Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] That is, *as a Chriſtian I thank my God.* So *Epheſ.* v. 20. *Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father*, in the Name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e. as Chriſtians:* See Note on *John* xiv. 14. and xv. 16.

Verſ. 17. *Note* b. It is a harſh tranſpoſition which our *Author* and others before him ſuppoſe to be in the Apoſtles words; nor is there any need of it, the ſenſe being commodious if we underſtand them thus: "That from the Faith whereby the Jews believed the Prophets, "and the Gentiles their Anceſtors, they might proceed to another "Faith. The oppoſition here which is between ΕΚ and ΕΙΣ, confirms this Interpretation. *Clemens Alexandrinus* uſes the ſame phraſe in

in his Book intitled, *Quis dives ſalvetur?* Sect. 8. p. 24. *Edit. Oxon.* where he ſpeaks of a Jew that was converted to the Chriſtian Faith: Ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, ſaith he, μετακόμισται, ὡς ἀσφαλερῶς ἐν νόμῳ σαλδεύων καὶ δεινῶς κινδυνεύων εἰς τὸ σωτήριον μεδορμίζεται: *He is carried from Faith to Faith, as being unſafely toſſed in the Law,* [like a Sea] *and having a dangerous ſtation in it, he betakes himſelf to our Saviour as to a Haven.* Chapter 1.

Verſ. 20. *Note* d. I ſhall ſet down in this place an Animadverſion of the learned Doctor *Pearſon*, formerly *Biſhop* of *Cheſter*, which is in his *Expoſition* of the Apoſtle's *Creed*, Art. 1. p. 19. *Ed.* 5. wherein he reprehends Dr. *Hammond*, and ſharply confutes *Socinus*; from whom our *Commentator* ſeems to have borrowed this Interpretation: "This "place, *ſaith he*, muſt be vindicated from the falſe gloſs of *Socinus*, "who contends that it cannot be proved from the Creature that "there is a God; and therefore to this place of St. *Paul* anſwers thus: "*Sciendum eſt verba* à creatione mundi *debere conjungi cum verbo* Inviſibilia —— *Ait igitur eo in loco Apoſtolus*, æternam divinitatem Dei, "*id eſt, id quod nos Deus perpetuo facere vult*, (Divinitas *enim hoc "ſenſu alibi quoque apud ipſum enuntiatur, ut Coloſſ.* ii. 9.) æternamque "potentiam, *id eſt, promiſſiones quæ nunquam intercident*, (*quo ſenſu "paulo ſuperius dixerat* Evangelium eſſe potentiam Dei) *hæc, inquam, "quæ nunquam poſtquam mundus creatus eſt ab hominibus viſa fuerant, "id eſt, non fuerant eis cognita*, per opera, *hoc eſt, per mirabiles ipſius "Dei & divinorum hominum, præſertim verò Chriſti & Apoſtolorum ejus, "operationes, conſpecta fuiſſe*. In which Interpretation there is no"thing that is not forced and diſtorted: for tho his firſt obſervation "ſeem plauſible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for "proof *Mat.* xiii. 35. κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, which proves not "at all that ἀπὸ κτίσεως has the ſame ſenſe: and it is more than proba"ble that it hath not, becauſe that is uſually expreſſed by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς "κτίσεως, *Mark* x. 6. and xiii. 19. 2 *Pet.* iii. 4. never by ἀπὸ κτίσεως. "Beſides, the κεκρυμμένα in St. *Matthew* bears not that analogy with "ἀόρατα which *Socinus* pretends, ſignifying not things unſeen or un"known till then, but only obſcure Sayings or Parables; for which "purpoſe thoſe words were produced out of the *Pſalms* by the *Evan"liſt*, to prove that the *Meſſias* was to ſpeak in Parables, in the Ori"ginal מְשָׁלִים חִידוֹת, in the LXX παραβολὰς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *i. e.* wiſe, "antient Sayings, which were not unſeen and unknown, for it imme"diately follows, *which we have heard and known, and our Fathers have "told us*, Pſal. lxxviii. 3. And tho he would make out this Interpre"tation, by accuſing other Interpreters of unfaithfulneſs, *Plerique* "*inter-*

Chapter 1.

" *interpretes ex præpositione* ἀ *fecerunt* ex, *contra ipsorum Græcorum ce-*
" *dicum fidem, qui non* ἐκ πίστεως *sed* ἀπὸ πίστεως *habent:* yet there is
" no ground for such a Calumny, because ἀπὸ may be, and is often
" rendered *è* or *ex* as well as ἐκ, as *Matth.* iii. 4. ἀπὸ τείχων χαμήλων, *è pi-*
" *lis camelinis*, and vii. 4. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, *ex oculo tuo.* 16. ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν,
" *ex spinis*; and even in the same sense which *Socinus* contends for,
" *Mat.* xvii. 18. ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, Vulg. *ex illa hora*, as *Tully*, *ex eo*
" *die*, and *Virgil*, *ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis*, and,
" *Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis Trojanæ.* So the Greek
" ἀπὸ μέρους the *Latins* render *ex parte*, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου, *ex æquo:* of which
" Examples are innumerable. There is no unfaithfulness then im-
" putable to the Interpreters: nor can such pitiful Criticisms give
" any advantage to the first part of *Socinus*'s Exposition.

" However, the Catholick Interpretation depends not on those
" words ἀπὸ πίστεως, but on the consideration of the Persons, that is,
" the Gentiles, and the other words ποιήματα νοούμενα, which he farther
" perverts, rendring them *the miraculous Operations of Christ and his*
" *Apostles*, or, as one of our Learned Men [Dr. *Hammond*] their
" *Doings*, mistaking ποίημα, which is from the Passive πεποίημαι, for
" ποίησις, from the Active ἐποίησα; for ποίημα is properly *the thing made*
" or created, not the *operation* or *doing* of it; as κτίσις is sometimes
" taken for the *Creature*, sometimes for the *Creation*, but κτίσμα is the
" *Creature* only. As therefore we read 1 *Tim.* iv. 4. πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ
" καλόν: So *Eph.* ii. 10. αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα. In this sense spake *Thales*
" properly, Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων Θεός, ἀγέννητον γάρ· κάλλιστον κόσμος, ποίημα γὰρ
" Θεοῦ, in *Laertius*.

" The other Interpretations which he was forced to, are yet more
" extravagant; as when he renders the *eternal Godhead*, *that which God*
" *would always have us to do*, or *his everlasting Will*, and proves that
" rendring of it by another place of St. *Paul*, Col. ii. 9. *For in him*
" *dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*; that is, says he, *all the*
" *Will of God:* (whereas it is most certain, that where the *Godhead* is,
" especially where the *fulness*, even *all the fulness of the Godhead* is,
" there must be all the Attributes as well as the *Will* of God:) and
" when he interprets the *eternal Power* to be *the Promises which shall*
" *never fail*, and thinks he has sufficiently prov'd it, because the
" same Apostle calls the Gospel *the Power of God.* For by this way of
" Interpretation no Sentence of Scripture can have any certain
" sense.

Thus he with a great deal of reason refutes *Faust. Socinus*, who in this matter shewed himself neither a Philosopher nor a Grammarian.

But

But he is too ſharp upon him, and at the ſame time upon Dr. *Hammond* for underſtanding the Phraſe ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου in the ſame manner as *Beza* did, who renders it *jam inde a Creatione mundi, ever ſince the Creation of the World.* They went according to the proper ſignification of the *Preposition* ἀπὸ; and the word ποιήμασι, which follows, being underſtood in the ſenſe that Dr. *Pearſon* would have it to be, proves it: *the inviſible things of God, from* or *ever ſince the Creation of the World, being underſtood by the things which he has made, are ſeen.* For if it had been St. *Paul*'s deſign to ſay what the learned Biſhop would have him, he ſhould have expreſſed it thus: ἐκ κτίσεως καὶ ποιημάτων, *by the Creation and* [his] *Works*, and not by ἀπὸ κτίσεως, τοῖς ποιήμασι, from *the Creation by* [*his*] *Works.* The Examples he brings to prove that ἀπὸ is uſed for ἐκ are nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe the Phraſes are different. He ſhould have given us an Example in which γινώσκειν τινὰ ἀπό τινος *to know any one from any thing* was put for γινώσκειν τινὰ ἐκ τινός. The Greeks ſay; ἐκ γὰρ ὀνύχων λέοντα, ἐκ τοῦ κρεσπέδου τὸ ὕφασμα, ἐκ τοῦ γλώσσης, ἢ λαθίοπα ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως, τὸ δίνδρον ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ, ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς γινώσκειν. But they ſay alſo ἀπὸ καρπῶν, (ſee *Matth.* vii. 16, 20.) tho the Prepoſition ἐκ is more commonly uſed in this Phraſe. I could confirm this by the Authority of many Interpreters who are far enough from Socinianiſm; but this way Dr. *Pearſon* himſelf does not take.

Further, tho it be very true that ποίημα does not ſignify an *Action*, but the *Work* it ſelf, or *thing done*; yet becauſe there is no *Work* without an *Action*, nor any *Action* of God without a *Work*, Dr. *Hammond* might well enough in his Paraphraſe make uſe of a word which ſignified an *Action*, being it included alſo in it the *Work* it ſelf. In fine, Dr. *Hammond* thought that what is here ſaid reſpected chiefly the *Gnoſticks*, in which I think he was miſtaken; but being of this opinion he was obliged to underſtand by the word ποιήματα, not ſo much the Works of Creation as of Providence, both ordinary, and principally ſuch as were extraordinary, and made a mighty impreſſion upon the Minds of Men in *Chriſt*'s time. As for *Socinus*'s Interpretation of the words *Power and Divinity*, as it is manifeſtly forced; ſo it is rejected by his Brethren of the *Poliſh* Society, *Crellius* and *Slichtingius*, in their *Commentaries* on this Epiſtle.

Chapter I.

Verſ. 23. *Note* f.] There are ſome things with relation to what our Author here ſays about the *Gnoſticks*, that deſerve to be conſidered, and I ſhall briefly ſet them down in this place, not deſigning afterwards to repeat them.

I. It cannot be deny'd, that there were even from the Apoſtles time pernicious Hereticks, to whom there is often a reſpect had in

Chapter I. these Epistles, as our Author has shewn: Of which number were the followers of *Simon*, if what the Antients say concerning them be true. And it is possible likewise that these Men might even at that time boast of their extraordinary Knowledg, and call themselves *Gnosticks*, tho that Name came to be more famous afterwards. Γνῶσις among the Christians of that Age did not signify only Knowledg or Learning in general, but also some peculiar knowledg of the abstruse Points of Religion, and the mystical sense of Scripture; in which sense we more than once meet with it in an Epistle of St. *Barnabas*. See in the *Greek*, *Chap.* 6. not. 35. and *Chap.* 10. not. 60. and in the *Latin*, c. 1. not. 15. of the *Amsterdam* Edition, and the learned Dr. *Pearson's Vindic. Ignat.* Part 2. c. 6. But yet that the Participle γνόντες in the 21*st* Verse has a reference to these Hereticks, I do not think, nor is it necessary.

II. The *Doctor* is *rash* in following *Justin Martyr*, who erroneously thought that *Simon Magus* was deified by the Romans, because there was a Statue at *Rome* consecrated to *SEMON SANCUS*, which was an antient Roman Deity. *Cæsar Baronius* indeed had gone before Dr. *Hammond* in this, but he had been corrected by *Des. Heraldus* in *Comment.* ad cap. 13. *Apolog. Tertul.* And *his* Opinion was afterwards confirmed by *Henr. Valesius* on *Euseb.* H. E. *lib.* 2. *c.* 13. and *Ant. Pagus* in *Epicr. Baroniana*, ad An. 142. I do not think there is any more truth in what is related concerning the Contest between St. *Peter* and him; but if it were true, the Romans had undoubtedly pulled down his Statue: for how could they have thought him to be a God who was overcome by a Man? but *Heraldus* justly calls this *a Fable* in his Notes on the second Book of *Arnobius*.

III. I do not doubt but the *Gnosticks*, or followers of *Simon*, imitated the Heathens; but I am of opinion, with most other Interpreters, that the Apostle had a respect here to the Heathens *themselves*, and particularly to their Philosophers, not those who *imitated* them. See *Grotius*. All that the Apostle here says very fitly agrees to the *Heathens*, but there are some things which cannot commodiously be applied to the *Gnosticks*.

IV. I wonder our learned Author should think the word δόξα here to refer to *Exod.* xxiv. and signify that Splendor which appeared on the top of *Mount Sinai*, when the Law was given to the Jews; and afterwards say that the Phrase *to change the Glory*, is borrowed from *Psalm* cvi. 20. For it had been sufficient to mention that Passage in the *Psalmist*, to which this here manifestly refers, and not to that Splendor or glorious Appearance. The *Glory of God* is God himself, or his eternally

eternally glorious Nature. If by the *glory of God* in this place, were to be underſtood that glorious *appearance* before ſpoken of, the crime charged upon the *Gentiles* would be, not that they had repreſented God by a viſible ſhape, but that they had made uſe of *another* than that. They ought to have expreſſed that ſplendor by Fire, as the *Perſians* uſe to do; not by figures of living Creatures, as the Greeks and Romans. In the *Pſalm* it is ſaid *they changed their Glory* כבודם *chbodam*. But St. *Paul* could not call God the glory of the *Heathens*, who knew very little of him; and perhaps in the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* of the *Pſalms*, which was uſed at that time by the Synagogues, the words were read as they are now in ours יתּ איקר רבנהון *the glory of their Lord*. Chapter I.

V. To ſhew how aptly what St. *Paul* here ſays, may be applied to the Heathens, and particularly their Philoſophers, I ſhall expreſs the ſenſe of his Diſcourſe from *Verſ.* 17 to the *26th*, in a ſhort Paraphraſe.

" 17. For in the Goſpel there is a way ſhewn, whereby thoſe that " believe it may obtain the pardon of their Sins from God, to the end " that from the Faith which they had in their former Religion, they " might be induced to believe the Goſpel; for to ſuch only we may " apply that paſſage of the Prophet *Habakkuk*, *The juſt ſhall live by* " *Faith*. 18. Thoſe who refuſe to believe it, ſhall be puniſhed by the " Divine Juſtice for their former Sins, which cannot be expiated any " otherwiſe than by Faith in the Goſpel; and whereof the greateſt " by far is that whereby the Heathens, and even their Philoſophers " do diſſemble the knowledg which they have of the true God, and " do not conform their Divine Worſhip to it. 19. For many of " them underſtood what God would have them know concerning " himſelf, and hath manifeſted to them, 20. From the beginning of " the World, by his Works, wherein his infinite Power and tran- " ſcendent Nature do illuſtriouſly ſhew themſelves, and are as it were " viſible; ſo that they have no excuſe to make for the abſurd Religi- " on which they profeſs. 21. Tho they knew how wiſe and power- " ful a Being God was, and had great experiences of his Goodneſs " and Bounty, yet they neither gave that honour to him openly, " which the perfection of his Nature challenged from them, nor " thanked him for his Benefits. And therefore God in juſt Indigna- " tion ſuffered them to fall into ſo many errors, which he would o- " therwiſe have delivered them from, that they even rendered the " moſt certain things doubtful. 22. And whilſt they profeſſed the " ſtudy of Wiſdom, they loſt their Underſtandings. 23. Being

Chapter I. " blinded through their own fault, as one error produces another, " they repreſented God whom they might, as I ſaid, have under- " ſtood to be an infinitely more perfect Being than a Man, not only " like a Man, but even like a Beaſt.

" 24. Nor did their depravation ſtop here, in the errors of their " Minds, or in Divine Worſhip, but they became alſo moſt impure " and abominable in their Lives, God not reſtraining them. 25. For " the ſame Perſons who had formed ſuch vile Images of the Godhead, " and ſo extremely unworthy of the Divine Majeſty, and worſhipped " thoſe Images, neglecting God himſelf; 26. As they had as much " as in them lay, diſgraced the Divine Nature; ſo forgetting alſo, " as it were, themſelves, they confounded the Offices of both Sexes, " which Nature has diſtinguiſhed, by Luſts not to be named, &c.

All theſe things the Heathens fell into, even their Philoſophers not excepted, as might be eaſily proved out of *Ariſtophanes*, *Laertius*, *Lucian*, the Satyrick Latin Poets, *Seneca*, and in a word all Antiquity.

Verſ. 29. *Note* i. *Lin.* 7. After the words, *giving over all labour*] This is an abſurd Tranſlation of the word ἀπηλγηκότες, which never had any ſuch ſenſe, but ſignifies *having loſt all ſenſe of Pain* or *Grief*. See on *Epheſ.* iv. 19.

Ibid. *At the end of that Note*] Tho πλεονεξία be truly deduced ἀπὸ τῦ πλέον ἔχειν, and is uſed both in a good and bad ſenſe, of Riches, or Power, or Victory, or endowments of Mind, and other things in which ſome exceed and go beyond others; yet I do not think it any where ſignifies *a deſire of Pleaſure*; nor does any of all thoſe places which our Author has here heaped together, prove what he intends, as I ſhall ſhew by a brief examination of them. For it is not ground enough, that ſuch or ſuch a ſenſe of a word is not foreign to the deſign of any place, nay that it is very agreeable to it, to infer that that is ſometimes the ſignification of that word; ſeeing the ſeries of the diſcourſe will often permit it to be taken in other ſenſes altogether as commodious; and leſs proper words likewiſe are many times made uſe of inſtead of more proper. And therefore before we make uſe of reaſoning to find out the ſignification of any word, the certain uſe of it muſt be otherwiſe known; for elſe it is very eaſy to miſtake. Now to review the Paſſages alledged by our Author: (1.) The words of St. *Paul* in *Epheſ.* iv. 19. will very well bear to be underſtood of *Coveteouſneſs*, as *Grotius* has obſerved, becauſe there were a great many of the Male Sex, that proſtituted themſelves for the ſake of Gain. (2.) The words of *Photius*, St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Antiochus*, do not neceſſarily

ceſſarily require the ſenſe of *Luſts*, but may eaſily be underſtood likewiſe of *Covetouſneſs*. (3.) The example of *Aſterius* proves nothing at all, becauſe his words may be very well underſtood of a deſire of Riches and Power, yea ought to be ſo. I have not indeed *Alexander Aphrodiſienſis*, nor can I conveniently get him; but I dare lay any wager, we ought to read πλέον ἢ *Nor more than he ſhould*; for that is the definition *of an unjuſt Man* τῷ ἀδίκῳ, nor does that word among the Greeks ever ſignify *a voluptuary*. (4.) Tho the *Septuagint* render the Hebrew word בצע both by πλεονεξία and μαμωνᾶς, it does not follow that theſe Greek words ought to be uſed promiſcuouſly. It is not to be thought that the Greek words made uſe of in the barbarous ſtile of thoſe Interpreters, are always of the ſame latitude with the Hebrew; and beſides, there was no neceſſary reaſon for the *Septuagints* tranſlating the Hebrew word in that place of *Ezekiel* by μαμωνᾶς. See Interpreters on the place. (5.) In the Prayer of *Ephraim*, there is nothing that ſhould oblige us to underſtand πλεονεξία any otherwiſe than it commonly is; for why may not we ſuppoſe him to ask pardon for his Covetouſneſs, as well as his Luſts or Uncleanneſs? Do not thoſe Vices ſometimes go together? (6.) Tho *Plato* uſes the Phraſe πλεονεξία τίνων after the mention of *Pleaſures*, it does not follow that πλεονεξία there ſignifies *Luſt*, for that Phraſe may be very well rendered *a greater abundance of theſe things*, *major horum copia*, as *Marſ. Ficinus* has tranſlated it. See *Plato* himſelf, *pag.* 508. *Ed. Genev.* of *Ficinus*. (7.) Πλεονεκτῶν τὸ ἀφθόνως in the Epiſt. of *Barnabas*, does not ſignify *to be luſtful*, but *multiplicare avarum*. See *Cap.* 10. Not. 51. *Edit. Amſtel.* (8.) It is without cauſe that the *Doctor* interprets *avaritia*, in *Polycarpus* and *Bede*, by Senſuality or the love of Pleaſures. Could not *Valens* be at the ſame time πλεονεκτὴς or *covetous*, and luſtful too? And do not ſenſual or luſtful Perſons uſe to be covetous, and to ſeize upon other peoples Poſſeſſions when they have opportunity, that they may ſpend them upon their Luſts? *Bede* does not ſeem neither to have confounded the word *avaritia* with the love of Pleaſure, tho he joins together things that are in effect often conjoined. The ſame may be ſaid of other Authors who have any like Paſſages; for what is more common than to ſpeak of ſeveral Vices together? (9.) Tho the *Sodomites* be upbraided for their πορνεία and κακία, it does not follow that theſe words properly ſignify villanous *Luſts*; they are general terms, by which their wickedneſs may be deſcribed, whatſoever it conſiſted in, as the conſtant ſignification of thoſe words ſhew. (10.) Of the Paſſages cited by the *Doctor* out of St. *Paul*, I ſhall ſpeak when I come to them, as alſo of the other places of the New Teſtament. (11.) The word

Chapter I.

ἀδικία

Chapter II. ἀδικία in *Gen.* vi. 5. is a general name likewiſe, ſignifying any ſort of Vice or Wickedneſs, and not particularly *Luſt*. Our Author made it his buſineſs to enquire not what was the conſtant and uſual ſignification of a word, but what he would have it to ſignify, that he might the better apply ſome paſſages in St. *Paul* to his *Gnoſticks*.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THE Apoſtle as far as the eighth Verſe, goes on to condemn the Heathen Philoſophers, who did thoſe things which they condemned in others, and knew to be evil; upon which account they were reproached even among the Heathens themſelves: See *Lactantius Inſtit. Divin.* Lib. 3. c. 15. who produces out of *Cicero*, *Corn. Nepos* and *Seneca*, very remarkable Teſtimonies againſt thoſe who were Philoſophers more in words than in manners. Dr. *Hammond*, to make theſe things agree to his *Gnoſticks*, puts ſeveral things into his Paraphraſe, whereof there is not the leaſt footſtep in St. *Paul*. It is eaſy to find out what ſenſe we pleaſe in any Author whom we interpret, if we may take the liberty to patch up his Thoughts in that manner with our own. I wonder alſo at *Grotius* for thinking the Apoſtle here had reference to the Roman Magiſtrates, becauſe of the word κείνων which he ſaith properly ſignifies a *Judg*; when that word may as well be taken for any one *that judgeth*, as a Philoſopher who judgeth concerning Vice and Virtue, as a *Magiſtrate*. Yea *Plato* in Lib. 9. *Reip.* p. 506. *Edit. Ficini*, applies that word to a Philoſopher, where he ſpeaks of judging concerning what is good or evil. Δὶ ἃ γε δεῖ, ſaith he, ὀργάνῳ κείνεσθαι, ὃ μ᾽ φιλεκμᾶς τοῦτο τὸ ὄργανον, οὐδ᾽ φιλεπίμ, ἀλλὰ μ᾽ φιλεσόφ: *A covetous or ambitious Man is not qualified to judg, but only a Philoſopher.* And a great many more ſuch examples, if I had time, and it were neceſſary, might be found out to ſhew that a Philoſopher may be properly called ὁ κρίνων.

Verſ. 8. Τοῖς ἐξ ἐριθείας, &c.] This has a reſpect to the Philoſophers, who when they ought, according to their own Doctrin, to have obeyed the Goſpel, abuſed that skill in diſputation which they had acquired by the ſtudy of Philoſophy in reſiſting it. And ſuch were afterwards *Lucian*, *Celſus*, *Porphyrius*, *Hierocles*, and others, who out of a love to contention, oppoſed the Chriſtian Religion. Ἐριθεία is aptly to this purpoſe defined by *Phavorinus*, Καπηλεία, ἢ κακολογία, ἢ ἡ διὰ λόγων φιλονεικία, *contradicting or evil ſpeaking, or contending by words*, for which moſt of the Philoſophers were infamous.

Verſ. 9.

Verſ. 9. Θλῖψις, &c.] Here the Apoſtle returns to what he had ſaid in the 15th *Verſ.* of the foregoing Chapter, *viz.* that the Goſpel belonged to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*, and brought Salvation equally to them both; as in this place he tells them that if they continued in their Sins and Unbelief, and neglected the only way of Salvation, they would both bring deſtruction upon themſelves. Theſe he compares firſt with one another, and then inveighs againſt the *Jews* who perſiſted in their Sins; nor is there any thing that properly concerns the *Gnoſticks*, as any one will ſee that does but read the Apoſtle. Chapter II.

Verſ. 13. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι.] This Paſſage perhaps *Porphyry* had in his mind, who often read the Holy Scriptures that he might be able to oppoſe them, when he wrote in his Book *de Abſtinent.* c. 57. that it was impoſſible for a Man to attain εἰς τέλος, *i. e. to Happineſs*, μὴ ἀποτυλωθέντα μέν, εἰ χρὴ φάναι, τῷ θεῷ, ἀφηλωθέντα δὲ ἀπὸ σώματος, καὶ τῶν διὰ τοῦτο ἡδονῶν, *unleſs he were nailed, if I may ſo ſpeak, to God, and divided from the Body and the Pleaſures which by that affect the Mind:* δι' ΕΡΓΩΝ ἡμῖν ἡ σωτηρία, ἃ δὲ ΑΚΡΟΑΣΕΩΣ λόγων ψιλῆς γινόμενα· *for we are ſaved by* WORKS, *not by a bare* HEARING *of words.*

Verſ. 15. Γεγραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.] That is, they were not inſtructed out of the written Law, but their own Reaſon informed them what was good, and what was evil. For that is ſaid *to be written in the Heart or Mind*, which we underſtand by reaſoning, without any written Inſtitution. This is not oppoſed to the knowledg of the *Gnoſticks*, but of the *Jews*.

Ibid. *Note* c. To this purpoſe is that elegant Paſſage in *Plautus* in *Rudente*, Act. 4. Sc. 7.

Spectavi ego pridem comicos ad iſtum modum.
Sapienter dicta dicere atque iis plaudier,
Cum illos ſapientes mores monſtrabant poplo;
Sed cum inde ſuam quiſque ibant diverſi domum,
Nullus erat illo pacto ut illi jufſerant.

Verſ. 17. *Note* e. This is all forced. Read the Apoſtle himſelf, and it will appear that he ſpeaks of a *Jew* properly ſo called, and one that was circumciſed.

Ἐπονομάζεσθαι here, is not properly to be *called* or *denominated*, but to be *celebrated* or *famous*; ſo that St. *Paul*'s meaning is this: it is a thing univerſally known, that thou art a *Jew*, or a Diſciple of *Moſes*; this is what

Chapter II. what thou pretendeſt thy ſelf to be, and glorieſt in. The Apoſtle has no reſpect in this to the *Gnoſticks*, who could not neither be ſaid ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐν νόμῳ, *to reſt in the Law*, which they took not the leaſt care to obſerve, as our Author confeſſes, but when the fear of the *Jews* urged them to it.

Verſ. 18. *Note* f.] Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation of the Verb δοκιμάζειν may be confirmed by the Authority of an *old Gloſſary*, in which that Verb is render'd not only by *perpendere*, *examinare*, *to weigh*, *to examin*, but alſo *approbare*, *comprobare*, *to approve*. And in the ſame διαφέρω is rendered by *præſto*, *præcello*, *to excel*. But yet becauſe the Diſcourſe is concerning one that is able to teach others what is good and profitable, and what is not, or of a Maſter, I chuſe rather to underſtand it of *trying thoſe things that differ*, or trying the difference of things, that is, diſtinguiſhing between lawful and unlawful. And ſo in that Paſſage of the *Epiſt.* to the *Philippians*, δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα may ſignify to diſtinguiſh carefully good from evil, or not ignorantly to confound things which are different: Whence the Apoſtle adds ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς, *that ye may be ſincere*, that is, without mixture of good and evil, not ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed by you; and conſequently, as it follows, ἀπρόσκοποι, *without offence*. However, it is moſt true, that the Verb δοκιμάζειν does not only ſignify the examining of a thing, but alſo that which is conſequent upon it, the approbation of it. But this may very aptly be ſaid of the Jews compared with the Heathens, becauſe the Jews were *inſtructed out of the Law*, which the *Gnoſticks* were not, but were part of them Heathens.

Verſ. 19. Ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν.] The Blind cannot diſcern the right way from the Path which would lead them out of the Road they deſire to take; and therefore they need a Guide to diſcern it for them. And in like manner ſuch as cannot δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα, as to thoſe things between which the Will of God makes a difference, have need of a Teacher to ſhew them the difference between what is lawful and unlawful. This, and what follows, plainly confirms the Opinion which I have preferred to Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation, and agrees exactly to the *Jews* compared with the *Heathens*.

Verſ. 22. Ἱεροσυλεῖς.] I do not think the *Doctor* has expreſſed the Apoſtle's ſenſe here in his Paraphraſe, I chuſe rather to underſtand this word ἱεροσυλεῖς of ſtealing the Veſſels that were conſecrated to *Idols*; as if the Apoſtle had ſaid; "Thou who pretendeſt to abhor "Idols, as moſt polluted things, which thou wouldſt not ſo much as "touch, doſt nevertheleſs, if thou haſt an opportunity, ſteal the "Veſſels

"Veſſels which are conſecrated to them, and are as polluted as the "Idols themſelves. In which he has a reſpect undoubtedly to that Law in *Deut.* vii. 25. *The graven Images of their Gods ſhalt thou burn with fire; thou ſhalt not deſire the Silver or Gold that is upon them*, &c. Chapter II.

Verſ. 25. Περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, &c.] That is, it is advantageous for a Perſon to profeſs himſelf a *Jew*, and to carry about him the ſacred χάραγμα of that Religion in his body, provided he obſerve its Laws, and thoſe eſpecially which relate to a good Life, and the Intereſt of Human Society. I know Divines uſually call Circumciſion *a Seal of the Covenant*, in the ſenſe our Author uſes thoſe words. But ſee what I have ſaid of that matter in my Notes on *Gen.* xvii. 10.

Ibid. Ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου.] If thoſe who boaſt themſelves to be circumciſed Perſons, and bear the token of God's Covenant in their Bodies, neglect the moſt holy Laws delivered to them by *Moſes*, their Circumciſion can be of no uſe to them, which is only a ſign of their profeſſing Judaiſm, not the *whole* Jewiſh Religion.

Verſ. 26. Ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία.] That is, as all Interpreters have obſerved, the *uncircumciſed*. Circumciſion was inſtituted as a ſign of God's Covenant, with which all that were marked profeſſed their Reſolution to obey the only true God, Creator of Heaven and Earth. But if there were any among other Nations who, without that mark ſet upon the *Jews* only, obey'd God in thoſe things which they knew to be acceptable to him, their Piety was as pleaſing to God as that of the circumciſed *Jews*. That Sign was inſtituted only to put the *Jews* conſtantly in mind of their Duty, and not as a thing in it ſelf grateful to God.

Ibid. Εἰς φύσεως λογιεῖται.] That is, whoever obſerves thoſe Laws that are of eternal Equity, δικαιώματα, wherever he be, and what Nation ſoever he be of, ſhall be accounted by God in the number of his People, as much as if he were circumciſed. Δικαίωμα among the Greeks properly ſignifies *Equity*, or that which is alledged to ſhew a Cauſe to be juſt or good: But in the *Septuagint* it is uſed to ſignify the Laws of God of what kind ſoever they be: But in this place δικαιώματα are thoſe things which God may *equitably* require of all Nations, ſuch as Experience and right Reaſon dictate to be juſt.

Verſ. 27. *Note* h.] I wonder learned Men did not perceive there was an *Elipſis* in this Phraſe, and that the word ἐκδικῶ muſt be underſtood, which is expreſſed afterwards. The meaning of S. *Paul* is this: They that have been hitherto uncircumciſed, *as they are born* (for ſo the Phraſe ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία ſignifies) and yet obſerve the Moral Laws, are *Jews*, that is, in the number of God's People, not indeed accord-

Chapter III. ing to the letter of the Laws themſelves, but according to the mind of the Lawgiver; and accordingly will ſhew by their Example that you are juſtly condemned, who by the letter of the Law and Circumciſion are eſteemed the People of God: τὸν διὰ γεάμματος καὶ περιτομῆς Ἰουδαίους κρίνουν οἱ διὰ πνεύματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ὄντες Ἰουδαῖοι: *Thoſe that are Jews by the Spirit and Righteouſneſs, ſhall condemn ſuch as are Jews by the Letter and Circumciſion.* Afterwards in *Chap.* iv. 11. the Phraſe δι' ἀκροβυστίας has another ſignification, to wit, *among the uncircumciſed Nations*, or *whilſt they are uncircumciſed*; for the Preposition διὰ often ſignifies diſtance of place or time. See *ver.* 29. in which this Interpretation is confirmed. Of the ſignification of the word γεάμμα as it is oppoſed to the *Intention* or *Mind* of the Lawgiver, I have already ſpoken in a Note on *Mat.* v. 17.

Verſ. 29. Ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γεάμματι] That is, that Circumciſion is worthy of Praiſe, which is agreeable to the *ſpiritual* Intention of God in inſtituting carnal Circumciſion; not that which *according to the letter* of the Law is made in the Fleſh, which in it ſelf is neither good nor evil. So that when the Apoſtle uſes the Phraſe ἐν πνεύματι, it is as if he had ſaid κατὰ πνευματικὴν Θεοῦ βουλὴν, *according to the ſpiritual Intention or Will of God:* as on the other hand, ἐν γεάμματι is the ſame with κατὰ τὰ γεάμματα νόμου, *according to the letters of the Law.* Whence in the Writings of St. *Paul*, the Law of *Moſes* is often called γεάμμα, *the Letter*; and the Goſpel πνεῦμα, *the Spirit*, becauſe this revealed the ſpiritual Intention of God, which was concealed under the letter of the Law. See 2 *Cor.* iii. 6.

Ibid. Οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων.] *To wit*, the *Jews*, who highly preferred a Perſon that was circumciſed to one that was not, having little or no regard to how they both lived. *They* conſidered the *letter* of the Law, and not the *ſpirit* of the Lawgiver; and ſo neglecting Mens internal Qualifications, commended chiefly their external.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. *Col.* 3. *lin.* 16. NOthing could have been ſaid more falſly concerning the Original of the word λόγια, which was commonly uſed by the Greeks in that ſignification before ever the Greek Language was ſpoken in the Land of *Canaan*. It was uſed by *Herodotus* and *Thucydides*, who lived whilſt the Perſian Monarchy ſtood; nor did the *Septuagint* for any other reaſon call the *Pectoral* λόγιον, tho improperly and barbarouſly, than becauſe that word ordinarily ſignified in Greek an *Oracle*, and λόγια in the Plural

Plural, *Oracles*; which were ſo called becauſe they were οὐ λόγῳ, that is, audibly pronounced or expreſſed, when otherwiſe the Gods were ſuppoſed to give their Reſponſes by Dreams, Intrails, Signs, or Omens without any Voice. This derivation of the word ſeems to be more proper than that which is given of it by *Thucydides*'s Scholiaſt in Lib. 2. p. 104. *Ed. Æm. Porti*, where on thoſe words of the Hiſtorian; πολλὰ μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο, πολλὰ δὲ χρησμολόγοι ἦδον: *Many Oracles or Reſponſes were given, many things were ſung by the Prophets*; he makes this Remark; Λόγια ἐστὶ τὰ ἄφθεγκτα τῶν Θεῶν λεγόμενα καταλογάδην· χρησμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι ἐμμέτρως λέγονται: Λόγια *are thoſe Reſponſes which are made by God in Proſe, and* χρησμοὶ *thoſe which are given in Verſe.* Hence alſo the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom*, chap. xvi. 11. and the Son of *Syrach* in *chap.* xxxvi. 16. call λόγια the Revelations of God by the Prophets. And ſuch the Apoſtle here means, and not the Reſponſes given by the High Prieſt, as *Grotius* has ſhewn. But our Author being deceived by the ambiguity of the word, treats of the Pectoral in an improper place. Chapter III.

Ibid. In the ſame *Col.* after the words, *Judgment of Urim.*] How foreign all this is to this place in St. *Paul*, I have already ſhewn. But I have one or two things more here to obſerve. *Firſt*, That the *Doctor* took what he here ſays out of *Rob. Scheringamius* in his Notes on cap. 8. *Jomæ*, as he has done other things alſo of that nature. *Secondly*, That the *Rabbins*, whoſe Authority he here alledges, were as ignorant of this matter as we, only they had the confidence to ſet down their own Inventions for known and certain Truth, which is a very uſual thing with them. Every one knows, that during the ſecond Temple there was no *Urim* and *Thummim*; and I would not have any one ſo ſilly as to think that the *Rabbins*, who lived ſome Ages after the deſtruction of that Temple, underſtood by certain Tradition what *Urim* and *Thummim* were. Their Opinion is evidently confuted by *Spencer* in his Treatiſe of *Urim* and *Thummim*, cap. 3. ſect. 11. As for me, I think quite otherwiſe of the whole matter, as I have declared in my Notes on *Exod.* xxviii. 30. and *Numb.* xxvi. 21.

Ibid. *Col.* 4. in that *Note*, *lin.* 10. after the words *dead Witneſſes.*] I have ſhewn that λόγια ſignifies in Greek God's *Reſponſes*, without any reſpect had to the *Pectoral*; and λόγια ζῶντα, as has been well obſerved by *H. Grotius*, are *enlivening* or *quickning* words. I wonder he did not alledg to that purpoſe *Heb.* iv. 12.

Ibid. *lin.* 20. after the words *there conſiſted*] Our learned Author heaps Miſtakes upon Miſtakes; for it is certain στοιχεῖα has no alluſion to the *Pectoral*, and does not ſignify *Letters*, but the Rudiments or firſt Principles of Piety.

Chapter III.

Verſ. 4. *Note* b.] That the Doctrine which our Divine here teaches is very true, conſidered in it ſelf, no one can doubt, that underſtands the nature of the Goſpel-Covenant. But I expected he ſhould have acted the part of a Grammarian rather than a Divine, and reaſoned not from the Analogy of Faith, but the grammatical uſe of words. What our Author therefore has not done, ſhall be briefly done by me. And, firſt, It muſt be obſerv'd, that the words צדיק in Hebrew, and δίκαιος in Greek, are moſt frequently uſed in the largeſt ſenſe, to ſignify a good Man, or one that loves Righteouſneſs, but are ſometimes taken in a more limited notion, and ſignify a Man who is guiltleſs of any particular Crime. Of the firſt ſignification we may every where meet with Examples; of the latter there is an Inſtance in *Prov.* xvii. 15. *He that juſtifieth the guilty* (רשע) *and he that condemneth the juſt* (צדיק) *are both an Abomination to the Lord.* See alſo *Iſa.* v. 23. And agreeably to this twofold ſenſe of the word *Juſt*, the ſignification alſo of the Verbs הצדיק and δικαιῶν *to juſtify*, is twofold; either for to eſteem *juſt*, that is, good; or *juſt*, that is, innocent or guiltleſs of the Crime charged upon him. In this latter ſignification they are uſed in the Paſſages before mentioned in the *Proverbs* and *Iſaiah*; but this Notion in this diſpute concerning Juſtification, can have no place: For God does not *juſtify* any Man from all Sin, that is, account him guiltleſs; becauſe all Men are Sinners. But there remains another ſenſe, in which God may properly be ſaid to eſteem thoſe *juſt*, that is, good Men, and acceptable to him, who believe in Chriſt, tho their Righteouſneſs be not perfect or ſinleſs; becauſe he mercifully accepts of an imperfect Vertue inſtead of a perfect one, upon the account of Chriſt's Sacrifice. And in this ſenſe it is ſaid of *Abraham* that ἐδικαιώθη, *he was juſtified*, that is, accounted a juſt Man, not according to ſtrict Juſtice, but the gracious acceptance of God, who judged him to be a good and pious Perſon: Whence it is ſaid in Scripture, that *Abraham believed God, and it was counted*, or *imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*; that is, that Faith was look'd upon as the Act of a good Man, and one that feared God; and therefore *Abraham* was judged by God to be ſuch an one. See my Notes on *Gen.* xv. 6.

Theſe things, if carefully obſerved, will give great light into this whole Diſputation of St. *Paul*, which is otherwiſe hardly intelligible. The *Jews* affirmed, that by the bare obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*, as they interpreted it, a Man was *juſtified in the ſight of God*, that is, accounted juſt by *God*, and accordingly accepted by him, and might expect from him the Reward promiſed to all good Men. And they thought

thought they could exactly fulfil the Law in all points, and ſo be juſtified as good Men upon that account; meaning by the obſervation of the Law, a Life ſo regulated, that no Charge could by any one be brought againſt them out of the Law, as Tranſgreſſors of any of its Precepts, which had a threatning of Puniſhment annexed to it: And if they lived ſo, they thought the Reward of pious Men was juſtly due to them. This was the Opinion of the *Jews*, againſt which St. *Paul* diſputes, and ſhews that Men are not *juſtified by the Works of the Law*, that is, eſteemed pious by *God*; but *by Faith*, i. e. upon their believing God's Revelations, and for the future obeying them, tho they had not before obſerved the Law, or any of its Ceremonies: To which purpoſe he alledges the Example of *Abraham*, who, when uncircumciſed, was accounted juſt by God, upon believing his Promiſe. And he urges that no Man can juſtly contend with God, becauſe all have heinouſly ſinned, and therefore ſtand in need of God's pardoning Mercy in order to their being accounted juſt: With many other Arguments, of which, as the matter ſhall require, I ſhall afterwards ſpeak. Chapter III.

Two things I will further obſerve in this place; *Firſt*, That δικαιοῦσθαι here is taken in that ſenſe in which I ſaid a Perſon was *juſtified*, who is not eſteemed guilty of any unjuſt or wicked Action: for *David*'s meaning in *Pſalm* li. 6. is this, that he acknowledged he had committed a very great Sin, ſo that he had no reaſon to doubt of the Divine Juſtice in threatning to puniſh him. *Secondly*, That towards the end of the foregoing Annotation, Dr. *Hammond* does ill compare the Phraſes *to be imputed to Righteouſneſs*, and *to be accounted worthy of a Reward*, with one another, as will appear if we look into St. *Paul*'s words.

Verſ. 8. *Note* d.] There is no neceſſity of any *Parenthеſis* in this place; if we do but ſupply the word πάλιν from what follows, the ſenſe will be plain thus: *Why yet am I alſo judged as a Sinner? Why do not we* do, *as we are ſlanderouſly reported, and as ſome affirm that we ſay, that we will do evil that good may come?*

Verſ. 25. *Note* b. *lin.* 13. after the words *propitious to the People.*] Our learned Author is miſtaken in thinking that the Hebrew word כפרת *chapporeth* is indifferently rendered ἱλαστήριον and καταπέτασμα. There is only one place in *Exod.* xxvi. 34. where the *Septuagint* can ſeem to have tranſlated it by καταπέτασμα; but if it be more narrowly look'd into, it will appear that they read פרכת *pharocheth*, which is the name of the Veil that was drawn over againſt the moſt Holy place, and thought that *Moſes* was commanded to put the Ark there within that ſpace. I have rendered the place, *impones operculum arcæ teſtimonii*

Chapter III.

nii *in ſanctiſſimo adyto, Thou ſhalt put the Covering upon the Ark of the Teſtimony in the moſt Holy Place*; and they, καταπετάσμα τῇ κιβωτῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. And it is certain τὸ καταπέτασμα ſignifies only a Veil, which καταπετάννυται *is extended*, in order to hide any thing; and ſo they conſtantly tranſlate פרכת *pharocheth*, which is the name of the Veil or Curtain that hid the moſt Holy Place. But a Covering, ſuch as that was which was put upon the Ark, would be more fitly called in Greek κάλυμμα, or ὑπόκαλυμμα, or πῶμα, or by another Name. I fear our learned Author confounded the Hebrew words alledged, becauſe of the ſimilitude there is between them, and through want of memory.

Ibid. *Lin.* 39. After the words, *to be performed.*] To ſpeak freely my opinion, I am apt to think there is no alluſion here to the Covering of the Ark, but that Chriſt is called ἱλαστήριον, *ſubintell.* ἱερεῖον or θῦμα *ſacrifice*; becauſe immediately there is mention made of *Blood*, which has no affinity with a *Covering*. So the Greeks call ἱλαστήριον, a Sacrifice offered up by way of Thankſgiving. But I confeſs I never could meet with that word in this ſenſe ſave in the old *Onomaſticon*, where ἱλαστήριον is rendred *propitiabile*, which word is to be underſtood actively, for that which is capable of pacifying or rendring God propitious, as in like manner *impetrabilis* ſignifies one that can eaſily obtain what he deſires. So that the *vulgar* who renders this word *Expiationem*, and *Beza* who renders it *Placamentum*, i. e. an *expiatory Sacrifice*, have tranſlated it better than others, who render it by *propitiatorium*, *a propitiatory*, by which word is generally underſtood the Covering of the Ark.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] Tho what our Author here theologically diſcourſes be very true, yet it does not much conduce to the underſtanding of St. *Paul*'s words, if the proper ſignification of them be conſidered. Πίστις ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, is here ſpoken of, not for the reaſons mentioned by our Author, but becauſe the Diſcourſe is about an expiatory Sacrifice, whereof the Blood can be of no uſe to us unleſs we believe on Chriſt, and hope that by his Sacrifice God will become propitious to us, tho we have been great Sinners againſt him.

Ibid. Διὰ τὴν πίστιν.] The Doctrin indeed laid down by our learned Author in the foregoing Annotation, I heartily ſubſcribe to; but I think it is foreign to this place, as depending upon a wrong interpretation of the word πίστις. The ſcope of the Apoſtle is to ſhew that there is another kind of Righteouſneſs brought in by Chriſt, which he calls *the righteouſneſs of God*, different from that which reſults from Works, and by which *we are juſtified freely by his Grace*, *through*

through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. And for the clearer explaining of that, he adds; *whom God hath set forth as an Atonement, through Faith in his Blood*; that is, "which *Jesus* God declares in the "Gospel to be an expiatory Sacrifice, by whose Blood the Sins of "those who believe on him are expiated: *To make known his Righteousness, because of the remission of former Sins under the forbearance of God*; "—To shew that those are just in his sight, whose past Sins he has "remitted, and whose Repentance he did not in vain wait for: *At this time, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that is of the Faith of Jesus*; "which at this time only is manifest to all: whence we may con- "clude, that God is both a lover of Righteousness, and also accounts "those just who have believed in Christ, and heartily obey him. The whole series of the Discourse does as it were proclaim this to be the scope and sense of the Apostle; and I wonder that *Grotius* himself did not see it, tho the *Doctor*, who often gives forced Interpretations of Places, might easily not discern it. Chapter III.

Tho I do not deny that the δικαιοσύνη, or *Righteousness* of God, is often put for his *Goodness and Mercy*, as *Grotius* has shewn; yet in this dispute it has another signification, as appears from *Chap.* i. 17. and *vers.* 21, 24, and 26 of this *Chapter*, where it is manifestly taken for *Gospel-Righteousness*, that is, for sanctity of Life, consequent upon Repentance. And this Righteousness which *God* accepts, upon the account of *Christ's* Sacrifice, is not grounded upon *a connivence* or *taking no notice of past Sins*, but the *remission* of them. For God accounts those just, not whose Sins he overlooks or connives at, but those whose Sins he has already pardoned, and upon their Repentance takes into his favour, contrary to their deserts.

I contend that πάρεσις is all one with ἄφεσις, and that the Preposition διὰ cannot be urged to prove πάρεσιν to be the same with παρόντων. Nothing is more common in the Greek Language, than for Prepositions to lose their proper force in compound words, as every one knows, who has had but the least taste of that Language. And therefore Grammarians and Greek Writers make the words πάρεσις and ἄφεσις promiscuous. *Hesychius* interprets παρίημι not only by ἐῶ, καταλιμπάνω, *to suffer, to omit*, but also by συγχωρῶ, ἀφίημι, *to grant, to remit*, and πάρεσις by ἄφεσις *remission*. So *Dionysius Halicarnass.* Antiq. Rom. *Lib.* 2. p. 103. *Ed. Sylburg.* παρίεμεν ὑμῖν τὸ ἁμάρτημα ταύτην ἔχοντες: *We forgive them this Offence without setting any fine upon them*; or if you please, *we let it go unpunished*, which is the same with pardoning. And *Lib.* 7. he opposes πάρεσις not to *remission*, but *delaying* or putting off: *p.* 446. Παρὰ δὲ τὸ δυμαίνειν πολλὰ ἀναβάλλεται τὴν ὑπὸ ὁλοχαῦ

ΠΑΡΕΣΙΝ

Chapter IV. ΠΑΡΕΣΙΝ οὐχ ὑίεσιν, τὴν ἢ ὡς χείρων ὅσην ἰκέσιν ἀναβολὴν ἔλαβεν: *They did not, tho they begged very hard, obtain from the Tribunes a full* REMISSION, *but as long a delay as they desired.* So in *Ecclesiasticus*, Chap. xxiii. 2. φείδεσθαι *to spare*, and πορεύειν are put one for another: *Sins committed through Ignorance* φείσῃ *do thou spare O Lord; but the reproaches of those who by profession are Sinners* μὴ παρῇς *do not pardon.* So that all that learned Men have said about the distinction of πάρεσις and remission, comes to nothing.

Vers. 26. *Note* k. I have before interpreted the word δίκαιον, not a revenger of Sin, but a lover of *Righteousness*, or Gospel-sanctity; which agrees very well with the scope of the Apostle. For having said that God accounted those Persons just, whose Sins he had remitted, he adds with great reason, that God was nevertheless *Just* or *Holy*; lest the *Jews* should perhaps object, that by his Doctrin the *Justice* or *Holiness* of God was impeached, because he justified Men that had lived in a course of Sin. But he does but touch upon this here transiently, designing in the vi, vii, and viii*th Chapters* to speak to that matter more at large: So God is said to be just, in *Deut.* xxxii. 4. and elsewhere often.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 1. *Note* a. THO as to the thing it self, our Author seems to have reached the scope of this place, yet as to all the words he will not satisfy an exact Grammarian. For κατὰ σάρκα cannot without violence be interpreted ἐξ ἔργων, or also by *human strength*, both which he seems to think are meant by that Phrase. Κατὰ σάρκα in the places alledged by him, signifies *according to* the course *of the Flesh* or human Generation, as *Christ* is said *Chap.* i. 3. to have been *of the Seed of* David *according to the Flesh*; which signification cannot be pertinent here, unless these words be joined with πατὴρ *Father*, which yet he will not allow of: See *Chap.* ix. 3, 5. St. *Paul's* words therefore must be explained thus; *What shall we say then? that* Abraham *our Father hath found* (χάριν grace) *according to the Flesh?* that is, in the judgment of Man, or according to a carnal Judgment. It is certain this alone can be said; *for if* Abraham *was justified by Works, he hath whereof to glory* before Men, *but not before God.* So *John* viii. 15. *to judg according to the Flesh*, signifies to judg after the manner of Men. See also 2 *Cor.* i. 17. which very thing is expressed in 1 *Cor.* ix. 8. by speaking κατ' ἄνθρωπον.

The

The use of the Phrase κατὰ σάρκα in this sense, being thus known, it must be considered whether the Context requires it to be understood in this sense here. Now St. *Paul* shews in the foregoing Chapter, that all Men were Sinners, and therefore had nothing to alledg in their own defence; and that none could boast of their justification before God, as if they were therefore accounted just by him, because they had never sinned. This is the sum of the foregoing Chapter, whence it might be justly inferred that *Abraham* himself was not justified by Works before *God*; and therefore in that sense could not be said to have *found* or *obtained Grace before God*, but only in the judgment of Men, who cannot judg of things exactly, and to talk of whose judgment in this case is absurd. For which reason to the question proposed, that *Abraham our Father hath found Grace according to the Flesh?* the Apostle answers nothing, because it is confuted by the bare proposal of it, it being manifest that in this dispute he speaks of the judgment of *God*, and not that of *Men*. And therefore he goes on, *If* Abraham *was justified by Works*, if he was accounted just for his works κατὰ σάρκα in the judgment of Men, *he hath whereof to glory*, viz. πρὸς τὸν σάρκα, before Men; *but not before God*, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. These last words manifestly shew the judgment of *God* here to be opposed to the judgment of *Men*, of which there should accordingly have been something said before, and yet of which nothing will have been said, unless κατὰ σάρκα be interpreted κατ' ἄνθρωπον. This our Author was in some measure sensible of, as appears by his Paraphrase on the 2*d verse*; but he discerned it as other Interpreters also did, just as a Man *sees the Moon through the Clouds*, which put him strangely upon the wrack to find out the sense of these words, and the connexion of the Discourse. This *Verse* does not contain any *objection* made by the *Jews*, who not only said that *Abraham* was justified κατ' ἄνθρωπον, but also κατὰ Θεὸν ἔχειν, as the Scripture declares. It is rather a concession of St. *Paul*, wherein he grants that *Abraham* might possibly in the judgment of *Men*, for his spotless Life before them, be accounted just; which is not the thing here spoken to, the Discourse being about the *judgment of God*.

Chapter IV.

Vers. 5. Δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ.] That is, him who accounteth one just, that was before ungodly; because he believes in *Christ*, and obeys his Precepts. The Works which are excluded from Justification, are those which precede Faith and Repentance, and are *wicked* Works; in the room of which succeed Faith and new Obedience, which are accepted instead of constant Righteousness and Innocence: and therefore Faith is said *to be imputed for Righteousness*.

Chapter V.

Verſ. 11. Σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης.] Our learned Author's Paraphraſe on this and other Verſes, is ſo very full of his own Additions and Remarks upon what the Apoſtle ſays, that it is impoſſible almoſt to know what to attribute to St. *Paul*. He puts in ſo many *Parentheſes*, and repeats the ſame thing ſo often, that he makes it very difficult to diſcern the contexture of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe: And here particularly in this Verſe the word σφραγὶς might have been explained in much fewer words, which refers only to *God*, and ſignifies a *ſign* whereby *God* aſſured *Abraham* that he accepted of his Piety. So this word is uſed in 1 *Cor.* ix. 2. where St. *Paul* beſpeaks the *Corinthians* thus; *If I be not an Apoſtle unto others, yet I am ſo to you; the ſeal* (σφραγὶς) *of my Apoſtleſhip are ye in the Lord:* that is, by you it may be *known* that I am an Apoſtle, or you are a certain *Evidence* of my Apoſtleſhip. It is a Metaphor taken from the cuſtom of confirming things by ſetting a Seal to them. See Note on *Gen.* xvii. 11.

Ibid. Δι' ἀκροβυστίας.] I have ſaid on *Chap.* ii. 27. that theſe words ſignify *among the uncircumciſed Gentiles*, or *in the time of their Uncircumciſion*, not *in Uncircumciſion*. And here it is viſible, that when the Apoſtle had a mind to expreſs *that*, he uſes the Phraſe ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ, both in the Verſe before and after. Ἀκροβυστία in *Chap.* ii. 26, 27. ſignifies *the uncircumciſed Gentiles*; and therefore δι' ἀκροβυστίας may ſignify *among the uncircumciſed Gentiles*, as διὰ μέσου ſignifies *through the middle of*, and διὰ πάντων *among all things*. And it may alſo ſignify the *time in which any one is uncircumciſed*, as διὰ βίου does *in Life*, and the like.

Verſ. 17. *Note* b. St. *Chryſoſtom's* Interpretation is a mere Nicety, as *Beza* rightly thought, nothing being more common in Scripture than this Phraſe, *before* God, לפני אלהים, which has no ſuch ſignification, as in the place alledged by our Author out of *Gen.* xvii. In this it ſignifies *truly*, tho Men, *viz.* the *Jews*, falſly thought otherwiſe. See my Notes on *Gen.* x. 9.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 5. Διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου.] That which ſeems to be intended by theſe words is, a power of doing Miracles conferred on the Apoſtles and innumerable others by *Chriſt*, as the *Doctor* intimates in his Paraphraſe. For hereby the Apoſtles and the reſt of the Chriſtians were aſſured that Chriſt would not diſappoint thoſe who waited for the accompliſhment of his promiſes, having already ſo plentifully beſtowed on them the promiſed gifts of his Spirit.

Verſ.

Chapter VI.

Verſ. 7. Ἀγαθῦ.] That is, as our Author well obſerves in his Paraphraſe, ἀγαθοποιῦ *beneficent* or *charitable*, which is more than δικαίυ *juſt*. So in a great many places *God* is ſaid to be ἀγαθὸς, which ſignifies not his Goodneſs, that is, his *Sanctity*, but his *Bounty*, or ἀγαθοεργία towards Men: See *Pſalm* cxxxvi. So *Mat.* xx. 15. *Is thine Eye evil becauſe I am good?* ἀγαθὸς ἐγω, that is, *bountiful*, as the Parable ſhews. So in *Ælian Var. Hiſt.* Lib. 3. 17. Ταραντῖνοι ἐγένετο ἀγαθὸς Ἀρχύτας, *Archytas was good to the* Tarentines, *i. e.* a Benefactor to them. So the *old Gloſſes*; ἀγαθὸς, *bonus, benignus, good, gracious*; and *Phavorinus* among other things ſays, it ſignifies, ὁ χωρὶς αἰτήσεως τὰ καλὰ χαριζόμενος ἀφθόνως, *one that without asking beſtows good things freely.*

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 3. Ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς χριςὸν.] The ſenſe of this Phraſe is not ſufficiently expreſſed by our Author, nor by other Interpreters. The Particle εἰς here ſignifies, as it uſually does, the end of Baptiſm; and the Apoſtle's meaning is no more than this, *we were baptized* TO *this end, that we might be Chriſtians.* So in 1 *Cor.* x. 2. the antient *Jews* are ſaid *to have been baptized* εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν, *i. e.* to that end that they might be the Diſciples of *Moſes*: See Note on *Mat.* xxviii. 19. And ſo in the next words, εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ſignifies *to the end we might imitate his Death*, viz. Chriſt's.

Verſ. 6. *Note* a. *Col.* 1. *Lin.* 34. after the words, *in the notion of* ſtry] There are ſeveral things in the beginning of this Annotation I cannot aſſent to.

1. To confirm the ſenſe our learned Author puts upon the word σῶμα he alledges places as parallel that are not. For there is a great difference between places in which the word σῶμα is joined with *Pronouns Poſſeſſive*, where the diſcourſe is about *Men*, as *my Body*, &c. and places in which it is joined with the names of other things. There is no doubt but the Phraſe *my Body*, is often all one with *I my ſelf*, by a *Synechdoche* of the *part* for the *whole*, common in many Languages. But when other Names are added to the word *Body*, the Phraſe is quite different, becauſe they cannot be ſaid to conſiſt of two parts, of which one may be called the *Body*, and give a denomination to the whole thing, as to a *Man*. Nor is there any compariſon between Phraſes, whereof one, as the *Logicians* ſpeak, ſignifies a *ſubſtance*, as when *Body* is attributed to a Man, and the other an *accident*, as *the body of Sin*, if that Phraſe be to be underſtood of Sin it ſelf.

Chapter VI.

II. I had rather in this place, and ſuch others, recur to another very frequent Idiom of the Hebrew Language, whereby a Noun Subſtantive in the Genitive Caſe is put for an *Adjective*, and ſo by the *Body of Sin* underſtand a *ſinful Body*, or a Body obnoxious to Sin: which Interpretation how agreeable it is to this place I ſhall afterwards ſhew. So in *Chap.* vii. 24. σῶμα θανάτου τούτου is *a Body obnoxious to death*, as I ſhall prove. And *Phil.* iii. 21. σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως and σῶμα τῆς δόξης is manifeſtly *a vile Body* and *a glorious Body*. *From whence*, ſaith St. *Paul*, (viz. *from Heaven*) *we look for our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall change our Body of Vileneſs, that it may be faſhioned like unto the Body of his Glory.*

III. By the *Body of Sin*, or *obnoxious to Sin* here, we are to underſtand *reduplicative*, as the Schoolmen ſpeak, the Body as *ſuch*, or the *Body as a body of Sin*. The Apoſtle does not reſpect the *Subſtance* it ſelf of the Body, but this *quality* of it, that it is the original, incentive and inſtrument of Sin, as he tells us in the next *Chapter*. And it is certain ſenſible things do not draw us to ſinful Actions any other way than by affecting our Bodies, and by that means impreſſing our Minds. And that moſt of the Sins we are guilty of, proceed from an inordinate love of *ſenſible things*, every body will readily acknowledg. After therefore the Apoſtle had ſaid *our old Man was crucified*, that is, we had left our old ſinful Cuſtoms, he very fitly adds, that hereupon that deadly and deſtructive Power which was in our Bodies to draw us to Sin was taken away, ἵνα καταργηθῇ, ſaith he, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, *ſo that the body of Sin is weakned* or *diſabled*, for ſo I interpret the Particle ἵνα by the figure called *Ecbaſis*, not as a *Cauſal*. So *Col.* ii. 11. *In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without hands, in the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh*; for that Body which before ſerved *Sin*, is as it were put off, in order to put on another *new* Body which may ſerve *Righteouſneſs*. The change is in the *uſe* of the Body, not in the *ſubſtance* of it, that is here meant.

IV. The Hebrew word עצם *hetſem* properly ſignifies a *Bone*, not the *Body*, of which there is no Example, and comes from a Root which ſignifies *to be ſtrong*, becauſe the *Bones* are the *ſtrongeſt* parts of the Body. But afterwards, I know not for what reaſon, it came to ſignify *the thing it ſelf*, which the Diſcourſe related to. Inſtead of *Judg.* 9. our Author writes *Joſ.* 9. as it is falſly quoted alſo in *Vak Schindler*, from whom, or ſome other *Lexicographer*, he took it upon truſt, without looking into the place, which is thus: *Remember that I am* עצמכם, *your Bone and your Fleſh*, which is a Hebrew Phraſe uſed to ſignify *Conſanguinity*. See my Notes on *Gen.* ii. 23. The Phraſe in

Job

Chapter VI.

Job ii. 5. *Touch his Bone* עצמו *and his Fleſh*, is a *Periphraſis* of the *Body*, which conſiſts chiefly of Fleſh and Bones. Nor do either of thoſe places ſerve the *Doctor*'s deſign. I confeſs, among the *Rabbins*, the word עצם is uſed to ſignify a *Subſtance*, as it is oppoſed to *Accidents*, and that עצמי ſignifies *my ſelf*; but it would not be properly rendred σῶμα *Body*. Of the word σωματικῶς in *Col.* ii. 9. I may have occaſion to ſpeak *elſewhere*, for we have nothing to do with it *here*.

Ibid. *At the end of that Note.*] Theſe deſcriptions of Regeneration illuſtrate indeed the *thing* St. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, but do not ſhew us what is the proper meaning of the *Phraſe* καταργῆν τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, which was moſt requiſite. The word καταργῆν is as ſeldom uſed by Heathen Writers, as it is frequently by St *Paul*, in whom it occurs more than twenty times. The ſimple Verb ἀργέω ſignifies *to be at reſt, to ceaſe*, from ἀργὸς or ἀεργὸς, *idle, one that has nothing to do*. And hence καταργέω is *to make to ceaſe*, and by conſequence to render *vain* or *uſeleſs*. In the *Old Gloſſary* it is rendered by *caſſo to fruſtrate* or *make void*, and καταργεῖ by *avocat calls off*, viz. from buſineſs, to ἀεργία *idleneſs*, or *reſt*. And *Phavorinus* has καταργήσῃ, νικήσῃ, παύσῃ, *ſhould overcome, ſhould make to ceaſe*; καταργῶ τὸ ἀποπαύω, ἢ πληρῶ, καταργήθη γὰρ ὁ νόμος, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεπαύθη, *to make to ceaſe, and finiſh*: for καταργήθη ὁ νόμος, is as much as ἀπεπαύθη, *it was made to ceaſe*. And ſo here καταργῆν σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is to make thoſe Sins which have their riſe from the Body to ceaſe.

Verſ. 19. *Note* b.] I. I believe our Author never look'd into the Paſſage in *Demoſthenes*, for if he had, he would have ſeen that it was nothing to his purpoſe, and would have otherwiſe tranſlated it. It is in the Greek *Ed.* of *Morellus*, Num. 72. where *Demoſthenes*, ſpeaking of the Stripes inflicted on him by *Midias*, ſaith, τίς ἀνθρωπίνη ἢ μετρία συγγνώμη φανεῖται ὑπὲρ τούτων αὐτῷ; *what excuſe will ſeem human and modeſt for thoſe things which he has done?* That is, in which a Man would acknowledg that he had been humanly treated; of which Phraſe ſee *H. Stephanus* in his *Theſaurus*. The place in *Horace* ought to have been more exactly referred to: For who ever alledged a Teſtimony out of *Horace*, lib. 2. without adding *Carm. Sat.* or *Epiſt.*? That place is in *Epiſt.* 2. *Lib.* 2. ver. 70. where, ſpeaking of the tedioufneſs of the ways, which could not be travelled but with great pain, he *ironically* ſays, *Intervalla vides humanè commoda*, that is, *valde commoda*, or ſuch as you would in all reaſon deſire. The *Doctor*, who did not look into the place, renders it *parum commoda, little profitable*.

II. The latter Interpretation is favoured by *Phavorinus*, who ſaith out of a *Lexicon* which contained perhaps the words of Scripture, of which

Chapter VII.

which ſort there are a great many in the *Italian* Libraries: Ἀνθρώπινον, σύμμετρον, μικρόν. Καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω, διὰ τὴν ἀδύνειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. But S. *Chryſoſtom* ſeems to favour the former, who interprets it by ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ γινομένων: from *human reaſonings, from thoſe things which are commonly* or *cuſtomarily done.* And indeed the word λέγω ſufficiently ſhews, that τὸ ἀνθρώπινον is to be underſtood περὶ τῆς λέξεως *of the Apoſtles form of ſpeaking:* And becauſe words borrowed from common uſe are plain and clear, therefore the Phraſe ἀνθρωπίνως λαλῶν ſignifies to ſpeak plainly, as it is uſual to ſpeak, not in a bigger or more ſwelling ſtile than ordinary, and conſequently more obſcure. A Cook in *Strato* in *Phœnicide* is brought in ſpeaking of another that uſed old faſhioned and poetical words, thus:

Πλὴν ἱκετεύω γ' αὐτὸν ἤδη μεταβαλεῖν,
Ἀνθρωπίνως λαλεῖν τι.

But I earneſtly beſeech him to change his Dialect, and ſpeak humanely. It is in the 9th Book of *Athenæus* cap. 7. on which ſee *Iſ. Caſaubon.* It is certain what St. *Paul* had ſaid before was not κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἔθος, and therefore it is no wonder if, changing the form of his Diſcourſe, he ſays here ἀνθρώπινον λέγω. So alſo the Latin *humanè* is oppoſed to *poeticè* in *Petronius* cap. 50. *Minùs quàm duabus horis mecum moraris, & ſæpius* poeticè *quàm* humanè *loquutus es*; *You have been with me leſs than two hours, and have talked oftner* poetically *than* humanely.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 5. *Note* c. OUR Author confounds here things that ought to be diſtinguiſhed, and diſtinguiſhes between things that are the ſame, becauſe he had a greater regard to Divinity than to Grammar.

I. *Being in the Fleſh* is a Phraſe here applied to the *Jews*, who obſerved only the *letter* of the Law, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, that is, its *carnal* Commands, which reſpected only the Body, but had no regard to the ſpiritual deſign of them. But this could not be ſaid of all the *Jews*, among whom ſuch as were pious did doubtleſs take more care about real and inward Holineſs, than external Ceremonies. To this purpoſe is that Declaration in *Hoſea* vi. 7. concerning the *excellency of Mercy above Sacrifices*, and the like ſayings in the Prophets.

II. The Phraſe εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι, ſignifies to enjoy the ſpiritual ſenſe of the Law, not the literal or grammatical; that is, to regard the Mind

Mind or *Spirit* of the Lawgiver more than his Words, as the Chriſtians did. See on *Chap.* ii. 29. and compare that Verſe with the foregoing, which will ſhew what is the meaning of the word *Spirit* on one hand, and *Letter* or *Fleſh* on the other; for theſe two laſt are uſed promiſcuouſly. Chapter VIII.

III. But becauſe they that followed only the carnal ſenſe of the Law, were not lovers of true Piety, the Phraſe *to be in the Fleſh*, taken in this ſenſe, draws another Notion along with it, which is to indulge the Luſts of the Body, or κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι, *to be according to the Fleſh*, thoſe Phraſes being indifferently uſed by St. *Paul*, chap. viii. 5, 8, 9.

Verſ. 7. *Note* e.] But the diſcourſe is not about a *Jew*, who could not doubt but that Coveting, which was forbidden by the Law, was a Sin, but one that knew not the Law, as thoſe *Jews* which lived before the Law was given. Unleſs God had prohibited coveting, they had not believed it to be a Sin no more than moſt of the Heathens. To ſeize upon what was anothers by force, or ſecretly take it away, they knew to be Theft, and a thing manifeſtly prejudicial to human Society, and therefore evil and offenſive to God; but they did not think it unlawful either to covet what was not their own, or to get what was another's by Artifices, ſuch as are uſed by Merchants, who think they may lawfully do a great many things either to raiſe the Price of their own Goods, or to buy anothers cheap, and the like, which are undoubtedly unjuſt, tho very agreeable to the Cuſtom of moſt Nations. But this ἐπιθυμίαν, or coveting, God forbad, and that inward affection from which ſuch Sins proceed, as I have ſhewn on *Exod.* xx. See alſo on *Mat.* v. 28.

Verſ. 15. Ὃ θέλω.] That is, *would*, *vellem*, as *Grotius* and others have rightly obſerv'd. See 1 *Cor.* vii. 7. So it is uſed alſo by *Anacreon* in the beginning of his *firſt Ode*:

Θέλω λέγειν Ἀτρεΐδας,
Θέλω δ' Κάδμον ᾄδειν.

I would *ſpeak of the Atridæ*, *I* would *ſing alſo of Cadmus.*

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. THO it be very true, that he who is freed from *the Law of Sin*, is freed from Sin; and that the *Law of the Spirit* is not without the Spirit, ſo that what is ſaid of the Law of the Spirit may be ſaid alſo of the Spirit; yet neither of theſe Phraſes can be properly and literally explained ſo as our Author inter-

Chapter VIII.

interprets them. The *Law of Sin* is properly the *Dominion of Sin*, as appears from the 23*d* Verse of the foregoing *Chapter*, namely, because it belongs to a Ruler to impose Laws. And on the contrary, the *Law of the Spirit* is the *Dominion of the Spirit*: So that St. *Paul*'s meaning is, that the Spirit which Christ gives, and whose Commands Christians obey, does free them from the Dominion which Sin formerly had over them; which is so manifest, that in his Paraphrase the *Doctor* has followed this Interpretation: Only having no regard to propriety of Speech in his own stile, he is as careless of it in interpreting anothers.

Vers. 4. *Note* c.] *Grotius* in his Notes on *Chap.* ii. 26. interprets this word in a sense quite contrary to Dr. *Hammond*. *The Apostle*, saith he, *here explains what he means by νόμος, to wit,* מצות, *which is usually rendered* δικαιώματα, *not only by Interpreters, but also by* Josephus, *and properly signifies such things as are in their own nature good and just, as I have said on* Luke i. 6. and in *Lib.* 1. *c.* 1. 9. *de Jure B. & P.* But they are both in an error; for, *First*, The distinction which the *Rabbins* make between the *Hebrew* words מצות *mitsvoth* and חקים *bhukkim*, has no foundation either in their Etymology or Use, as I have observ'd on *Gen.* xxvi. 5. *Secondly*, The *Greek* word δικαίωμα is used by Greek Interpreters to signify the Divine Laws in general; and tho they most commonly render חקים by δικαιώματα, yet they use also that word sometimes where the Hebrew has מצות. See *Deut.* xxx. 15. and 1 *Kings* ii. 3. Among Attick Writers, or the best Grecians, δικαίωμα signifies a *Statute*, *Jus*, or *Record*, *Instrumentum*, by which the justice of any Cause is determined; but in the Old and New Testament God's Ordinances or Institutions, of what sort soever they be, are called δικαιώματα, because it is *just* δίκαιον, to obey them; and sometimes the observation of those Laws it self, as in *Rev.* xix. 8. which place our Author forces. So that it must be collected from the thing it self, and not from the word, whether the Discourse be about Moral Precepts or others.

Vers. 15. Πνεῦμα δουλείας.] The word *Spirit* here manifestly signifies an affection of the Mind, as the *Spirit of Jealousy* in *Numb.* v. the affection of a jealous Mind, and so in many other Phrases of the same kind. St. *Paul*'s meaning here therefore is, that the manner of God's Behaviour toward the *Jews*, had rather produced in their Minds a *slavish* Disposition, than a *filial* one. But wherein did that servile Temper consist? This we are told in the following words εἰς φόβον *to fear*, that is, that ye should be governed more by fear than by hope; for that is the case of *Servants* who stand in great fear of their Masters,

Masters, but hope for very little from them; whereas *Children* hope much from the bounty of their Parents, and fear but little. But what was the reason why the Jews *fear* of God was greater than their *hopes? Namely*, because the breach of his Laws, excepting Sins of Infirmity, and some of less moment, was threatned with Temporal Punishments, which were unavoidable whilst the Jewish Commonwealth stood and flourished, and God had not any where promised Mercy to Persons so offending, either in this Life or in the next, or allowed any place for Repentance: Because he had not appointed any Expiatory Sacrifices in the Law for spiritual Sins, such as Pride, or Covetousness, or the like, tho he had denounced no Temporal Punishments against them; whereby it came to pass, that tho covetous, proud, or any other such sort of Sinners had nothing to apprehend from the Magistrate, yet they were afraid of being punished by God, who had made no Promises so much as to the penitent. But under the Gospel things are quite otherwise, as I need not here at large shew. Chapter VIII.

This is what Dr. *Hammond* ought only to have expressed in his Paraphrase, which may be gathered from St. *Paul's* words themselves, and not arbitrarily have inserted foreign things into his Discourse. Compare with this place *Gal.* iv. 1, *&c.* Who in reading St. *Paul* would ever have dream'd that under those things, which are signified by the *Spirit of Adoption*, were contained the mild Punishments of the Church? Where did Christ, where did his Apostles teach any such thing? More might be said which I designedly pass over.

Vers. 19. *Note* f.] If ever any thing was written by Dr. *Hammond* that was harsh and forced, (and a great many Instances of such things might be given) it is certainly what he says in this place, as I shall briefly prove.

I. He confesses that the δόξα μέλλουσα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, in the 18*th* Verse, is either a deliverance from the Persecutions of the Jews in this Life, or the happiness of the next; of which *last* it is only to be understood, the Discourse being about that Inheritance whereof we are joint Heirs with *Christ*, which respects only the other World. But the Apostle goes on: *For the Creature lifting up* (as it were) *its head* (ἡ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως) *waits for the Revelation* (ἀποκάλυψιν) *of the Sons of God*; which manifestly shews that he still speaks of *the Glory which is to be revealed*, and which makes nothing to the distinction that was to be put between the incredulous *Jews*, and those among them who believed and obey'd the Gospel. If our Author had not been

Chapter VIII. used to a most intricate Stile, he would soon have perceived that he offered Violence to the Series of the Discourse.

II. The word ἀποκαραδοκία cannot be applied to such an *expectation* as he describes, for we are properly said ἀποκαραδοκᾶν, when upon previous notice given of it, we understand there is some great happiness to be looked for, and which we impatiently expect, tho perhaps we do not know perfectly what it is. But the *Gentiles* knew *nothing* at all of their vocation to the true Religion upon the Gospel's being rejected by the *Jews*. Who will believe that St. *Paul*, in order to express the Affection of the *Gentiles*, plunged in the greatest ignorance and wickedness, and who accordingly could not be said otherwise than ἐκζητεῖν, ἐκκαρδοκεῖν, to be in expectation of the Gospel, would make use of a word that has a singular *emphasis* in it? It had been hardly tolerable if he had mollified it as much as possible, by adding ὡς ἔνιοι εἶπον, or some such other form. The phrases *to seek death*, and *to love death*, which signify to do those things which such as *sought* or *loved death* would do, are not here to the purpose. For the Heathens did not do what those ought to have done who were in a longing expectation of the Gospel. The words of *Jacob* in *Gen.* xlix. are otherwise to be understood, as in my Notes on that passage I have shewn. Nor is there any necessity of interpreting the words of *Haggai* of the *Gentiles*, to whom Christ should be as yet unknown; but they may be very well understood of those which, after they had already embraced the Gospel, should make Christ their *desire*, that is, should long to enjoy his promised Benefits, and see him returning from Heaven to judg the World. This is that which is the object of our ἀποκαραδοκία, or *earnest expectation*.

III. It is very true that ἡ κτίσις in the Language of the *Rabbins*, signifies *men*. Our Author might also have added, that in the same dialect the word ברייה signifies *Heathens*, in opposition to *Jews*, as his Countryman Dr. *Lightfoot* on *Mark* xvi. 15. has observed. The meaning of St. *Paul* therefore is, that the *Heathens* who were converted to the Christian Faith, did earnestly expect the time when *the Sons of God were to be revealed*, that is, as the foregoing and following context shews, were to be made partakers of eternal Glory and Happiness by Christ after the universal Judgment. He *distinguishes* afterwards *himself* and the believing *Jews* from the *Heathens*, when he says that *not only they*, or *the Creature*, *did expect* that time, *but we also that have the first fruits of the Spirit*, i. e. we *Jews* who have first received the Holy Spirit from God. The *Gentiles* at this time were no longer in expectation

tion of what the *Jews* were about to do; for the Gospel upon their rejection of it, and continuing incredulous, had been preached a good while ago to the *Gentiles*, as is plain from the History of the Apostles, and that account of times which our *Author* himself gives us in his *Premonition* to this *Epistle*. Chapter VIII.

4. Besides, I cannot imagin whence our Author inferred, that the happiness of the *Gentiles* did depend upon the *obduracy* of the *Jews*; as if upon supposition that the whole *Jewish* Nation, or the greatest part of it, had believed in *Christ*, the *Gentiles* were never to have had the Christian Faith preached to them! We are told indeed, both by Christ and his Apostles, that the Gospel was to be preached first to the *Jews*, pursuant to God's decree, but no where to them *alone*. There was no difference to be made in this matter between the *Jews* and the rest of the World, but only in the *time* of preaching the Gospel. If the whole *Jewish* Nation had received *Christ*, they had understood that the *Gentiles* were to be called to the same Faith, and that they must abandon their Rites and Ceremonies; and so all the *Jews* had become the Disciples of *Christ*. I confess the obstinacy of the *Jews* was the occasion of the Apostles going to the *Gentiles*; but what the Jews obstinacy was the occasion of, Religion and Charity would have obliged the Apostles to, if the Jews had all or most of them believed in Christ. This we may conclude from the story of *Cornelius* in *Acts* x. to whom St. *Peter* was directly sent before the Apostles had departed from the Jews. And this *Christ* expressly commanded in *Mark* xvi. 15. and *Acts* i. 8. So that it hence also appears that our Author puts a wrong interpretation on this discourse of St. *Paul*.

Ibid. *Note* g. The *Revelation of the Sons of God* is manifestly the same with *the Adoption* spoken of in *vers.* 23. and that being nothing else but an admission into the Kingdom of Heaven in the view of all the World, the *Revelation of the Sons of God* must be that same Action of God whereby he will make known to all, who those are that he acknowledges for his Sons. The series of the discourse puts this out of all doubt: *The* CREATURE *earnestly waits for the* REVELATION OF THE SONS OF GOD, *in hope because the Creature it self also shall be delivered from the bondage of Corruption, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God: for we know that every Creature groaneth, and travelleth in pain until now*; and NOT *only they* [expect, *to wit*, the Revelation of the Sons of God, and groan because of their present condition] BUT *we our selves also who have the first Fruits of the Spirit, groan likewise our selves within our selves, waiting for the* ADOPTION *of Sons*, viz. *the Redemption of our Body*. The *Doctor*

Chapter VIII. hinder'd his diſcerning this, by mixing a great many foreign things with St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, of which there is not the leaſt mark or footſtep in the *Apoſtle*, perhaps to have the reputation of ſaying ſomething new.

By *the Revelation* or *Adoption of the Sons of God*, is ſignified an act of Chriſt, acknowledging thoſe that are his, at the day of Judgment, in ſome ſuch words as thoſe, *Come ye bleſſed*, &c. becauſe it does not now appear who are the Sons of God by any particular and viſible evidences of the divine Favour towards them above the reſt of Mankind, and ſo others *deny* them to be by a ſpecial privilege the *Sons of God*; but when *Chriſt* comes to ſeparate the Godly from the Wicked, this will be plain and manifeſt. See *John* 1 Ep. iii. 1, 2.

Verſ. 20. *Note* i.] Our Author covers one Miſtake with another, to keep them, as one ſaid, from leaking. This I moſt of all wonder at, that he ſhould produce the Example of a moſt ſuperſtitious Heathen, and moſt malicious and implacable Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion, *viz. Porphyry*, as a Philoſopher who groaned under the burden of Idolatry. Whoever reads his Writings and his Life, writ by the learned *Luc. Holſtenius*, and underſtands but the nature of that new Platonick Philoſophy, will ſoon perceive that no Men were ever more devoted to Idolatry, than *Porphyry*, and the reſt of the Philoſophers of that Age. Our Author ought rather to have produced the Examples of *Socrates*, *Plato*, and *others*, who in ſome meaſure diſapproved Idolatry, than of ſuch as were its greateſt Champions, and with all their might defended it againſt Chriſtianity.

But there was no need of recurring to that, for the word ματαιότης does not ſignify *Idolatry*, nor is the Diſcourſe here about *Idolaters*. For tho I ſhould grant our Author that Idolatry is called ματαιότης, and Idolaters ματαιοι, it does not follow, that wherever that word is uſed it muſt be ſo interpreted, or that it reſpects the Worſhip of Idols rather than any *other Vanities* of the Heathens. It may be better underſtood here of that *Emptineſs* or Vanity which is in all the things of this Life. For the Heathens who had embraced the Goſpel did earneſtly expect that time wherein they knew they ſhould be delivered from the *Vanity* of this World; *to wit*, when Chriſt ſhould openly acknowledg and declare them to be the Sons of God, as I before ſaid. Thoſe who have entertained the Chriſtian Religion, and ſeriouſly conſidered it, do beſt of all know that thoſe things which relate only to this Life are ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων, *perfect Vanity*; ſuch only underſtand the truth of that ſaying of the Preacher, *Vanity of Vanities, all things are Vanity*, and of the Poet, *Heu quantum eſt in rebus inane!*

And

And accordingly the Heathens who had been converted to Christianity, did *groan* and as it were *travel* in pain, till they were set free from those vain Occupations, which partly necessity, and partly the ignorance and weakness of human Understanding, has imposed on us. Chapter VIII.

That is the proper signification of the word ματαιότης, *viz.* a *vain* desire or *labour*, for it signifies what is done μάτην *in vain*, as μάταιος signifies *frustraneous*, *insignificant*, and in the *old Glosses* is rendered by *inanis*, *cassus*, *vanus*, *supervacuus*, and ματαιότης *frustratio*, *vanitas*. Such are most of the Employmenss of this Life, designed either to procure what we judg profitable, or to redress those Evils which trouble and torment us, in which we often find our selves disappointed; so that we grow weary of our present Condition, and are made to wish for that time wherein being delivered from all these vain distractions we shall enjoy the happiness of the Sons of God.

Ibid. *Note* h. Having already overthrown what Dr. *Hammond* says in the foregoing Annotations, what he has here about the word ὑποτάξας must needs fall to the ground. The ὁ ὑποτάξας is *God* who has made Men for their Sins subject ματαιότητι *to vanity*, that is, as I said before, the vain employments of Life; which the Wise Man in *Eccles.* i. 13. and iii. 10. calls הבלים *habalim*, and the *Septuagint* elegantly render ματαιότητας. *This sore Travel*, saith he, (*this vain Labour*, ματαιότητα, as it may be rendred in Greek) *hath* GOD *given to the Sons of Men, to be exercised therewith.* And to so many vain labours with which humane Life is encumbred, we are *unwillingly subject*, and should not patiently undergo them but *for* God, who has subjected us to them, and in whose most wise and just Providence it is fit we should acquiesce. But in the mean while nothing hinders but we may desire to be delivered from these vexations, which will then only be, when *the Sons of God shall be revealed*, who now together with the wicked are subject to the same Troubles and Labours, and will not be set at Liberty till Christ's return. In comparison of this Interpretation, to omit the rest, Dr. *Hammond's* is violent; and all he says besides is nothing to the purpose.

Vers. 21. *Note* k. Φθορᾶς in this place, signifies nothing but that corruption to which our Body is naturally liable, and which in this Life we are unwillingly in Bondage to: *So* it is used in 1 *Cor.* xv. 42, 50. It is not the same with ματαιότης *vanity*, that being but a consequent of it; for the corruptibleness of our Bodies is the reason of our being exercised with so many vain Labours.

Vers. 23. *Note* l. Υἱοθεσία, as I before said, is that solemn acknowledgment of the Sons of God which will be made at the day of Judgment,

Chapter VIII. ment, presently after the ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος, that is, the Resurrection of the Dead. Now we are rather *ordained* or *appointed* ἀφωρισμένοι to be *the Sons of God*, than actually enjoy that Dignity; as *Jesus* was ὁρισθεὶς *determined the Son of God after his Resurrection*, as St. *Paul* speaks in *Chap.* i. 2. No one besides Dr. *Hammond* would say ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἀνθρώπων, when it is delivered from Persecutions.

Ibid. *Note* m. *Lin.* 9. After the words, *in a different sense.*] Our Author forgot himself when he wrote this, for we do not find this word ἀπολύτρωσις used in the 22*d verse*, nor any where else in this Chapter, or in this Epistle, but in *Chap.* iii. 24.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] It is much more agreeable to St. *Paul*'s stile and the series of his Discourse in this place, to understand the word ἀπολύτρωσις of the resurrection of the Body; after which we shall enter upon that Happiness which is opposed to the ματαιότης or *vanity* of this Life.

Vers. 26. *Note* n. There was no need of proving that δίδωμι in the New Testament often signifies *Diseases*, that being very well known, and to be learned by any *Concordance*. The rest our Author had from *Grotius*, and nothing is his own but his translating the Greek word πόνος by *labour*, which in this place ought to have been rendred *grief*; for the Hebrew never signifies *labour*, and the Greek is very often used in the *other* sense.

Vers. 28. *Note* o. *Col.* 1. *Lin.* 36. After the mention of 1 *Kings* i. 41, 49. 2 *Sam.* 14. 11.] Our learned Author is mistaken in his interpretation of these two places, as I have shewn on *Mat.* xx. 16. *Numb.* ii.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] Πρόθεσις here seems to be taken for that purpose or course of Life which those who embraced the Gospel lived in before they came to the knowledg of it; and so St. *Paul*'s meaning will be, that all things turn to the advantage of those to whom the Gospel-call was, κατὰ πρόθεσιν, *agreeable to* their former purpose, *i. e.* disposition of Mind, and manner of Life. And indeed those Persons prove the most constant, who receive the Gospel in *an honest Heart*, as Christ tells us in the Parable of the *Sower*, *Luke* viii. 15. because they throughly discern the beauty and excellency of it above all other Doctrins, and suffer it to sink deep into their Minds. They are distinguished in the New Testament by several commendable Characters, which Dr. *Hammond* has excellently treated of in his Annotations on *John* vi. 37. and *Acts* xiii. 48. and elsewhere. Such a one was *Cornelius* the *Centurion*, whose manner of Life was such that he needed not to change his πρόθεσις or *purpose*, to believe the Gospel.

Such

Such also were the *Bereans*, whom that εὐγένεια, or *excellent* and *generous* *Disposition*, which God had before planted in their Minds, had prepared for a ready submission to the Gospel, and all others among the Jews who with a pious Mind waited for the Kingdom of God, or among the Gentiles like them. These all persisted in their former *purpose* of living piously, and did not alter it when they embraced the Gospel. Chapter VIII.

The Verb προτίθημι signifying to *resolve* or *decree beforehand*, πρόθεσις must also be *a previous Purpose*, or *Resolution formerly taken up*: And that Purpose may be either concerning any thing in particular, or about the whole course of a Man's Life: so that what comes to pass κατὰ πρόθεσιν, or παρὰ πρόθεσιν, may be understood of what is either contrary or agreeable to a particular purpose, or the whole scope and aim of a Man's Actions. So προαίρεσις signifies both a single purpose, and προαίρεσις βίου the general course a Man resolves to live in. So *Propositum* in Latin is used in both those senses: And these words we may the more confidently compare with that here in St. *Paul*, because the Greek *Grammarians* use the former by which to interpret πρόθεσις, and the latter is manifestly an imitation of the Greek.

Hence when the discourse is about any particular thing, κατὰ πρόθεσιν signifies *on set purpose*, and παρὰ πρόθεσιν that which comes to pass *against our Will or Intention*. Thus in *Suidas* πρόθεσις is rendred by προαίρεσις *will* or *design*, of which he gives this Example: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδικήσαι τινα κατὰ πρόθεσιν, but he *did not injure any one wilfully*, or *on set purpose*. So the Author of the *Quest.* and *Answ.* to the *Orthodox Quest.* 19. speaking of the palpitation of the Heart, which takes Men sometimes on a sudden, demands εἰ δὲ φαῦλον τοῦτο, πῶς παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπέρχεται πρόθεσιν; *if this be an evil, how comes it to happen against our Will?* The same Phrase he uses in his Answer. That *Propositum* among the Latins signifies a certain way of Life, *Rob. Stephanus* in his *Thesaurus* has shewn by several Examples, as his Son *Henricus* will furnish us with others of the word πρόθεσις for *design* or *purpose*.

So that whereas *Beza* supplies here *ipsius*, *his*, and renders the words ex *præstituto ipsius*, *according to* [his] *purpose*, referring the word *purpose* to God; if any thing be supplied, I think it should rather be *suum* *their*. *And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to* their *purpose*. For that it is rather the *purpose* of *Men* than of *God* that is here intended, appears by the *Active Participle* ἀγαπῶσι, because if St. *Paul* had spoken only of God, he would have said ἠγαπημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *to them that are beloved of God*.

Vers.

Chapter IX.

Verſ. 30. Οὓς δὲ ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσε, &c.] The diſcourſe here being about a thing, which at the time that St. *Paul* wrote was as well both *preſent* and *future* as *paſt*, I would not have all theſe *Aoriſts* render'd by the *Preterperfect tenſe*, becauſe it is certain the *Aoriſt* among the Greeks, as the *Future* among the Hebrews, often ſignifies a *Cuſtom:* See my Notes on *Gen.* x. 9. So that I think theſe words ſhould be tranſlated thus: *Whom he hath predeſtinated, them he alſo calleth* (*i. e.* uſeth to call) and whom he hath called, them he alſo juſtifieth; and whom he hath juſtified, them he alſo glorifieth. That this is the Apoſtle's ſenſe all Interpreters acknowledg, only they did not obſerve that the *Aoriſts* denote a Cuſtom.

Verſ. 34. Κατακείνων.] That is, who ſhall *implead* or *prove them to be guilty?* For ſo the Lawyers ſpeak, amongſt whom this is an Axiom: *Peregiſſe reum non aliàs quis videtur, niſi & condemnaverit, A Perſon does not ſeem to be proved guilty, unleſs he be alſo condemned.* St. *Paul* ſpeaks of an accuſation before God, againſt Chriſtians, which he affirms would be ineffectual to procure their condemnation, becauſe they had *Jeſus* for their Advocate with the Father, if they lived according to the Laws of the Goſpel.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. IT is a perfect force our Author puts upon that expreſſion in *Acts* v. *to lie to the Holy Ghoſt*, of which ſee what I have ſaid on that place, as alſo of the Vow that *Ananias* is groundleſly ſuppoſed by learned men to have made.

Verſ. 4. *Note* c. *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 38. After the mention of *Heb.* ix. 5.] By *the glory of God* in *Acts* vii. 55. I rather underſtand ſome dazling *glorious Light*, than *Angels*. See my Note on *Mark* xvi. 19.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Lin.* 41. After the words, *moſt High.*] There is no ſuch expreſſion as this in *Job* i. 5. and I cannot tell whence our Author took it, unleſs it were from ſome Greek Interpreter on that place.

Verſ. 5. *Note* d.] It were to be wiſhed our learned Author had examined here the Animadverſion of *Grotius* on this place, rather than copied out Jewiſh Fables that make little to the purpoſe; eſpecially ſeeing *Eraſmus* had long ago written enough to overthrow all that can be inferred from them. For if what *Grotius*, and before him *Eraſmus*, have obſerved ſtand good, Dr. *Hammond*'s reaſoning cannot be thought of any force. Let thoſe that are inquiſitive into theſe matters compare both places.

Verſ.

Verſ. 9. *Note* e.] By the place in 2 *King.* iv. 16. it appears that the *Doctor* was in the wrong, to think that the Paſſage in *Geneſis* was corrupted, on which ſee my Notes. Chapter IX.

Verſ. 11. *Note* g.] There is no *election* or *chuſing* without *preferring*, and therefore there was no need of obſerving that the Hebrew word is rendred to *prefer* as well as to *chuſe*.

Verſ. 12. Ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι.] It being certain that theſe words are alledged by St. *Paul* in the ſame ſenſe that they are uſed in *Gen.* xxv. 23. they muſt here be underſtood not of the Perſons of *Eſau* and *Jacob* themſelves, but of their Poſterity: for theſe are the words of the Oracle; *Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two manner of People ſhall be ſeparated from thy Bowels, and the one ſhall be ſtronger than the other, and the greater ſhall ſerve the leſs.* Of which prediction ſee my Notes on that place in *Geneſis*. Therefore in this Paſſage of St. *Paul*, the Phraſe μείζων δουλεύσει ἐλάσσονι, ought not to have been rendred in the Engliſh Tranſlation, *the elder ſhall ſerve the younger*, but *the greater ſhall ſerve the leſs*. And ſo the Apoſtles ſcope alſo requires, who manifeſtly ſpeaks of the Election, not of *particular Perſons*, but of whole *Nations*.

Verſ. 13. Τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἠγάπησα.] It is manifeſt from the *Prophet*, that this has a reference to the Nations that deſcended from *Jacob* and *Eſau*, and not to them themſelves. So that I wonder our Author in his Paraphraſe, on occaſion of theſe words, ſhould obſerve that that Prophecy, *the greater ſhall ſerve the leſs*, was fulfilled perſonally in them, eſpecially ſeeing the contrary appears from the Hiſtory of *Moſes*, as in my Notes on the forementioned Chapter of *Geneſis* I have obſerved.

Verſ. 15. Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω.] This place I have interpreted on *Exod.* xxxiii. 19. and ſhewed the meaning of God to be, that "becauſe he had began to ſhew Favor and Mercy to the "*Iſraelites*, he would continue to do ſo: and this is all that is here intended by theſe words. The Apoſtle having ſaid that the Poſterity of *Jacob* were preferred by God before the *Idumæans*, becauſe it ſo ſeemed good to him, and not becauſe *Eſau's* Poſterity were worſe than that of *Jacob*, propoſes to himſelf an objection, *Is there unrighteouſneſs with God?* Which he denies with deteſtation, ſaying, *God forbid*; for, ſaith he, *he ſaid to* Moſes, *I will have Mercy on whom I have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I have Compaſſion:* that is, as God began to ſhew kindneſs to *Jacob* himſelf, ſo he continued his kindneſs to his Poſterity, without the leaſt injuſtice; becauſe he did not deny any benefit to the *Idumæans* which they had deſerved, but

Chapter IX. only went on to do good to the *Iſraelites* tho unworthy. For it is no injuſtice to be *merciful* to thoſe that do not deſerve it, tho it would be ſo to *puniſh* thoſe that do not deſerve it. Mercy may be juſtly ſhewn, when puniſhment cannot be juſtly inflicted.

As this Interpretation is favoured by the place referred to in *Moſes*, as I have ſhewn in my *Comment* on *Exodus*, ſo it agrees alſo with the Greek words as they are here accented, for we read them ἐλεῶ & οἰκτίρω in the *preſent tenſe Indicative*, which is not ſo favourable to the *vulgar* Tranſlation, according to which we ought rather to read in the *Subjunctive* οἰκτιρῶ, as it is generally accented in the Greek Copies of the *Septuagint*, ſo that it might be rendred as it is by *Beza*; *Miſerebor cujus miſertus fuero, & commiſerabor cujus commiſeratus fuero*; *I will have Mercy on whom I ſhall have Mercy, and I will have Compaſſion on whom I ſhall have Compaſſion.* But this is contrary to the Hebrew words which are thus: חנותי את אשר אחן רחמתי את אשר ארחם *I have favoured him whom I will favour, I have had Mercy on whom I will have Mercy*; where one of the Verbs is in the *future* tenſe, and the other in the *preterperfect*; which preterperfect is rendred here in the *Preſent*, becauſe it is the ſame thing, for God did ſtill then ſhew Mercy to the *Iſraelites*, and had never ceaſed to ſhew Mercy to them, when he ſo ſpake. Which being ſo, I wonder that *Beza* ſhould find fault with the *Vulgar*, and *Eraſmus* for making uſe here of the *preſent* Tenſe, and rendering it *cui miſereor*, or *cujuſcunque miſereor*, *To whom I ſhew Mercy*, or *to whomſoever I ſhew Mercy*, and give this reaſon for it, that *in the Hebrew the Verb is in both places in the future*, which the Reader has juſt now ſeen to be falſe. He adds that *the Particle ἂν ſhews it muſt be interpreted by the future as paſt*; and I cannot deny but that *Particle* uſes to be joined to a *Subjunctive*, but it being joined to a Preterperfect tence *Indicative*, it may be alſo joined to the *Preſent*, eſpecially where the purity of the Greek Language is not obſerved, as it is not in St. *Paul*. It muſt be obſerved further, that the words of *Moſes* are inverted; for whereas in him it is, *I have favoured him whom I will favour*, &c. the *Septuagint* underſtood it as if it had been ſaid, *I will favour him whom I do favour*, &c. becauſe tho thoſe Phraſes ſignify the ſame thing, yet the order of the words in the latter ſutes better with the Greek Language.

Verſ. 16. Οὐ τῦ θέλοντος, οὐδὲ τρέχοντος.] This ſeems to be a proverbial form of Speech, commonly uſed to ſignify that all human endeavours are inſignificant unleſs *God* countenance them. I ſuppoſe it was taken from the *Grecian Games*, to which St. *Paul* often alludes. In like manner an unknown Poet, in *Grotius's excerpta*, ſays that,

Ἀνὴρ

Ἀνὴρ βέλος εἰς κενὸν ταχθεὶς τρέχων.
A Man void of Counſel, labours and runs in vain.

The meaning is, that from the meer arbitrary pleaſure of God proceeded that favour he continued to ſhew to *Jacob*'s Poſterity, rather than to *Eſaus*; not from any thing that the *Iſraelites* had done to deſerve the divine Favor more than the *Idumæans*. From which Doctrin it followed that *God* might without any injuſtice, call the *Heathens* to the knowledg of the Goſpel, and reject the carnal *Jews*, tho otherwiſe the *Heathens* had done no more to merit this token of God's favour than the *Jews*. Having thus far endeavoured to clear the Apoſtle's ſenſe in this place, I ſhall ſubjoin a Paraphraſe of *ſeven* Verſes, from the *tenth* to the *ſixteenth*, to ſhew how aptly what I have ſaid agrees with St. *Paul*'s ſcope, and the ſeries of his Diſcourſe.

" Verſ. 10. And not only the Example of *Iſaac* and *Iſhmael* teaches " us, that it is not ſufficient for any Nation to have deſcended from " the *Patriarchs*, to claim to themſelves a right in the Divine Pro- " miſes, or entitle them *God*'s People. This appears likewiſe by the " inſtance of *Eſau* and *Jacob*, which *Rebecca* bare to one *Iſaac*. 11. For " before ever they were born, and conſequently had done good or " evil, by which to procure the favour of God, or make him their " Enemy; that the purpoſe of God concerning chuſing a certain Peo- " ple to himſelf, might appear to proceed from his own arbitrary " pleaſure, and not to have been excited by any Virtue or Merits of " that People; 12. God anſwered *Rebecca* when ſhe conſulted him a- " bout her Children ſtriving in her Womb: That ſhe carried in her " Bowels the Fathers of two great People; of which People that " which did firſt become the moſt numerous, and acquired the greateſt " Riches and Power ſhould afterwards ſerve the other, tho in the be- " ginning not ſo powerful. 13. To which purpoſe alſo is that ſaying " of God in *Malachi*, that he had preferred *Jacob* and his Poſterity, " to *Eſau* and his Progeny, and upon the former conferred much " greater Benefits. 14. Perhaps ſome may object that God, accord- " ing to this Doctrin, ſeems to be unjuſt, who, as I affirm, ſo much " prefers one People before another, that are no better than they. " But that does not in the leaſt follow from this Doctrin. 15. For " *Moſes*, whom none will affirm to charge God with any injuſtice, tells " us, that when he had prayed God to continue to go before the Camp " of the *Iſraelites*, tho they had deſerved his anger, and prevailed, " he received this anſwer from him, that the *Iſraelites*, tho they had

 " heinouſly

Chapter IX. " heinously offended him, since he had begun to shew them favour, " should find him also for the future gracious to them, and still be ac- " counted by him his People. 16. So that the Mercy of God in cal- " ling any Nation to the knowledg of himself, and making them his " peculiar People, does not use to depend on the Merits of that Na- " tion, but on his own free Will and arbitrary Purpose.

This is, if I am not mistaken, the Series of the Apostle's discourse; which being so explained, directly answers his design in this place, and admirably agrees with the sense of the places he refers to in *Moses*, as it is in *Moses* himself. About the 12*th* Verse we must consult *Grotius*.

Vers. 17. Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ.] The Particle γὰρ here seems to refer to the sense latent in the foregoing words, in which tho St. *Paul* speaks only περὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς *concerning the election*, yet by this very thing, that he declares God to chuse a Nation whom he may shew a peculiar kindness to, he intimates that he leaves other non-elect Nations in their Sins. For as I before suggested, there can be no election where something is not cast off, because that which is not chosen must necessarily be rejected. And to this the Apostle's words in this and the Verses following refer, wherein he discourses separately concerning *rejection*, as in the foregoing he had mostly treated about *election*. So that I should paraphrase this 17th *Verse* thus: " *Moses* also teaches us that, as to " the rejection or præterition of sinful Nations, whereby it comes to " pass that the People so abandoned fall into the greatest evils and " calamities, *that* may without blasphemy be imputed to God, be- " cause he says he was commanded to speak to *Pharaoh* in God's name " to this sense, that he, if he so pleased, could easily destroy both " the King himself and the whole *Egyptian* Nation, and so make his " People a free passage, which they had so often refused them, out of " their Country; but he would suffer *Pharaoh* still to live, that he " might give further demonstrations of his Power, and make his " Name great and famous throughout the World. See what I have written on *Moses*'s words, in *Exod.* ix. 15, 16. for what our *Author* says in the following Annotation, does not agree with them.

Ibid. *Note* h. Tho the Hebrew word be in the *Preterperfect* tense, yet I have rendred it in its proper place, as if it were the *Future*, because of the Verse foregoing, which seems to require its being so rendered: See my Notes on that place, by which this must be understood.

Vers. 18. *Note* i. By God's *hardening the Heart* of *Pharaoh*, I think is neither intended any action of God upon *Pharaoh*'s Mind, nor so much

much as any *withdrawing of his Grace* from him, seeing there is neither any mention made of such withdrawing in *Moses*, nor is it necessary to suppose it. Nor do I think that *Moses* purposely abstained from using the Phrase, *the Lord hardened his Heart*, till the *sixth* Plague that he inflicted upon that *Egyptian* King was past, as if then, and not before, he particularly forsook him. For before ever *Moses* went to *Pharaoh*, God foretold that he would *harden* him, *Exod.* iv. 21. which refers to all his obstinacy from first to last. See therefore my Notes on that place. Chapter IX.

Vers. 28. *Note* k. What our Author says in this Annotation he took from *Grotius*, with whom nevertheless I cannot agree in correcting this place out of one *Alexandrian* Copy, contrary to the Authority of all the rest, and the Antient Interpreters. It is harsh I confess for כי אם to be put after כלה, and the construction is intricate; but neither is it much clearer in the *Septuagint*. Besides, in alledging Testimonies of Scripture, there is but little regard had to the series of the Discourse, provided the Writers words are but to the purpose, and rightly quoted. The words in the Hebrew are thus, *vers.* 21. כלין חרוץ שטף צרקה which the *Septuagint* render, λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, *finishing and making up* his *account in Righteousness*; whence it is probable they read חרץ *hhorets*, the Participle *Benoni* for *Pahul*. Then follows in v. 22. כי כלה ונחרצה אדני יהוה צבאות עשה בקרב כל הארץ which they render, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον Κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ, *because an account cast up will the Lord make in all the Earth*, by which it appears that they thought כלין *chiljon* & כלה *chalah*, to signify *an account*; and if that be true, we may render the words something more commodiously, tho to the same sense, thus: *he will hasten an account exactly cast up in Righteousness*; *for an account, and that exactly cast up, will the Lord God of Hosts make in the whole Earth.* The words נחרצה & חרוץ signify *diligently and particularly cast up*; and this very thing in part συντέμνων also seems to signify, so as to be the same with ἀναλίσκω to cast up, or draw together several sums into one. And the Verb שטף, according to the use of the *Chaldee*, I render by *to hasten.* In French the words might be translated thus: *il dépêchera de faire exactement son compte avec justice, car le Seigneur créateur, Dieu des armées, fera un compte & un compte exact, dans tout le païs*; *He will hasten to make exactly his account with Justice, for the Lord God of Hosts will make an account and an exact account in all the Land.* The Prophet's meaning is, that as one who carefully casts up an account of his expences and receits, sees if there remains any thing over, and tho it be but a small sum lays it safe up; so God will destroy all the wicked, and save only

 the

Chapter X.

the good, tho they be but very few: which admirably well ſutes with the deſign of the Apoſtle. I ſhall add nothing more in this place, becauſe I intend hereafter, if God permit, to handle this matter more largely in a *Commentary* on the Prophet *Iſaiah*.

Verſ. 33. *Note* m. As there are two Paſſages here in the Prophet *Iſaiah*, at a conſiderable diſtance from one another, put together by the Apoſtle, ſo there are two Figures alſo conjoined. *Firſt*, Chriſt is conſidered as *a ſtone of Offence*, at which whether it be in walking or running, if any one do ſtumble, he is in danger of falling; and this refers to the Metaphors the Apoſtle had before taken from the Grecian *Games*, and particularly that of *Running*, which made him think of *a ſtone of Offence*, than which, in a ſwift motion, nothing can be more dangerous. Afterwards in the next words, *every one that believeth on him ſhall not be confounded*, Chriſt is repreſented not as a ſtone of Offence, but as *a corner ſtone*, which he that builds any Wall upon, muſt truſt to the firmneſs of; and if he be deceived in his confidence, after he has finiſhed his Structure, his building falls, and that fills him with ſhame.

This *latter* Similitude is in *Iſa.* xxviii. 16. where God ſpeaks thus; *I lay in* Sion *for a foundation, a Stone, an elect Stone* (if we read בחורה *behhourah* elect, for בחן *bohhan* a Tower) *a corner Stone and pretious, a moſt firm foundation. He that believeth ſhall not make haſt*, יחיש; that is, ſhall never be judged to have made too much haſt in chooſing it, nor ever be aſhamed of his choice. And the *former* is in *Chap.* viii. 14. *He ſhall be for a ſtone of Stumbling and for a rock of Offence to the two Houſes of* Iſrael; where the Metaphor is quite different, and it is no longer a corner Stone that is ſpoken of, but a ſtone on which a Perſons foot or the wheel of a Chariot happens to ſtrike, as the following Verſe more clearly ſhews.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. THE meaning of St. *Paul* in this place ſeems to be only this, that the Law promiſed nothing, but to thoſe that obſerved it ſo as *Moſes* taught it was to be obſerved; that is, unleſs either all its Precepts were obeyed, or the Sacrifices appointed by the Law were offered up for the expiation of ſome ſort of Sins againſt it. Otherwiſe it promiſed no Mercy from God to thoſe who had committed ſuch a Sin as the Law threatned with death, or allowed no Sacrifice for. But on the contrary, the Goſpel aſſures us that God will pardon ſuch ſins as thoſe, if the Sinner

ner does but firmly believe they shall be remitted to him, and abstain from them for the future. This is all we are here to consider; for what our *Author* says in his Paraphrase, that it was impossible the Law should be observed, *that* is so far from being the assertion of *Moses*, that he every where supposes the contrary, as appears even by the very next words. See my Notes on *Deut.* xix. 9. Chapter XI.

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 8. *Note* b. OUR Author truly observes, that according to the use of the *Atticks*, or those that spake the *purest* Greek, κατάνυξις signifies *compunction*; but he might have added that the Greek Interpreters, whether through ignorance, or according to the use of the *Alexandrians*, confounded the Verbs νύσσω & νυστάζω, the first of which signifies to *prick*, to *pierce*, and the latter *to nod* or *slumber*; which made them think that κατάνυξις signified *nodding*, tho it comes from the Verb κατανύσσω. It will be worth our while to read *Lud. Cappellus* about this matter, in his *Critical Notes* on *Psalm* iv. 4.

Vers. 12. *Note* d. I have often observed our Author to write so as not to make what he says at last to agree with what he had said at first; because, I suppose, after he had written half an Annotation he changed his Mind, and yet was loth to blot out what he had already written. And this we have an instance of in this place; for after he had proved that the word πλήρωμα signifies a *multitude*, he alters his opinion, and gives it another signification. But his second thoughts here were not the best, as I shall briefly shew. For

1. That this word does sometimes signify a *multitude*, appears also by *Hesychius*, who interprets it among other things, by πλῆθος.

2. The Hebrew מלא is not used for *collecting*, but for *that which fills up*, as the Lexicons will shew. Neither was a *multitude* so called ἀπὸ τοῦ πληρώματος *from a piece of Cloth* put into a torn Garment to make it whole again, but because it makes a πλήρη ἐκκλησίαν or *full* and complete *Assembly*, or ὅτι πληροῖ τόπους εἰς οὓς συναθροίζεται, *because it fills the places into which it is gathered together*. Perhaps also there may be a respect here had to the original of the word πλήρης, which is thus set down in the *Etymologicon*: Παρὰ τὸ πολὺ πλυήρης, καὶ κατ' ἀγκοπὴν πλήρης· ἢ ἐκ τοῦ πλῆθος πλήρης, καὶ κατ' ἀγκοπὴν πλήρης.

3. The *Jews* who were to come in late to Christ, are no more called πλήρωμα because of their filling up what remained empty in the Church, than the Heathens, who are called by the same name, and made up the greatest part of the Church.

4. I

Chapter XII. 4. I wish our learned Author had alledged the Passage he speaks of in *Seder Olam*, in Hebrew, or referred to the *Page*; for I have not leisure to read it all through, and the words he produces out of it look very suspiciously.

CHAP. XII.

Vers. 1. *Note* a. IT is so manifest that the word λογικὸς is to be understood only in this last sense, that I wonder our learned Author would spoil Paper, and lose time in proposing the other Conjectures. For they are such as may be reckoned indeed in the number of those things that have no natural repugnancy in them; but there is not the least shadow of likelihood in them, nor can they be confirmed by any example. But, unless I am mightily mistaken, he had never set them down, but only to fill up his Annotations on this Chapter, which he found would otherwise be but short. And a great many other things there are of the like nature in this Volume, which yet I pass by without reprehension: Such is what he inserts into his Paraphrase on this *Chapter* about the *Gnosticks*, without any necessity; as if there could have been none corrupted with Vices contrary to the Vertues which the Apostle here commends, besides the *Gnosticks!*

Vers. 2. Ἀναγκάσῃ τῷ νοΐ.] The word νοῦς here does not signify only *knowledg*, or an *opinion* conceived in the Mind, but an *affection* of the Soul: And thence comes μετάνοια, which is not only a change of *Judgment* or *opinion*, but also of *Affections*. See *Beza* on *Mat.* iii. 2.

Vers. 5. Ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ.] That is, we all make one body of Christians, or all we Christians are one Body. The Phrase εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ is often used by St. *Paul* for *being a Christian*. So *Chap.* viii. 1. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, that is, *to Christians*: See likewise *Rom.* xvi. 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13. and 2 *Cor.* xii. 2, &c. This I thought fit to observe, because I perceived this expression was not understood by *Grotius*, who says here; *We are one body* in Christ, *that is*, by *Christ who was the Compactor of that Body*; for tho that be true, yet it is not the meaning of the Phrase.

Vers. 6. Ἀναλογίαν πίστεως.] That is, let him say no more than what ἐπιτρέπῃ αὐτῷ *he is entrusted with*; in which word the Apostle has a reference to the antient *Prophets*, who were to say nothing but what God *revealed* to them: See *Vers.* 3. and *Ephes.* iv. 7. and *Beza* and *Grotius* on these words, whom our Author would have done well to follow, and not suffered himself to be imposed on by that which is

now

now ordinarily called the *Analogy of Faith*. I wonder the Engliſh Translation did not ſuggeſt to him another Interpretation of this Phraſe, in which it is truly rendered, *according to the proportion of Faith*. Chapter XII.

Verſ. 8. Ἁπλότητι.] This word ἁπλότης our Author in his Notes on *Mat.* vi. 22. has very well ſhewn to ſignify *liberality* or *bounty*; of which interpretation I ſhall here give this brief account. Ἁπλότης or *ſimplicity* is oppoſed to διάκρισις *putting a difference*, or uſing too much Caution in diſtinguiſhing thoſe that are proper objects of our Charity from thoſe which are not. Hence the *Wiſdom which comes from above* is ſaid in *James* iii. 17. not only to be *full of* MERCY *and good Fruits*, but alſo ἀδιάκριτος *without difference*, that is, not too nice or ſcrupulous in putting a difference between thoſe which it does good or ſhews *Mercy* to. To which purpoſe is that advice in *Herma*, Paſt. *Lib.* 2. *Mand.* 2. OMNIBUS *in opibus da* SIMPLICITER, *nihil dubitans cui des. Omnibus da. Omnibus enim dari vult Deus de ſuis donis. Qui ergo accipiunt reddent rationem Deo quare acceperunt, & ad quid. Qui autem accipiunt ficta neceſſitate, reddent rationem, qui autem dat innocens erit. Sicut enim accepit à Domino, miniſterium conſummavit, nihil dubitando cui daret & cui non daret; & fecit hoc miniſterium* SIMPLICITER *glorioſe ad Deum. Give to* ALL *that are poor* SIMPLY, *without ſcrupling whom you give to. Give to all. For God will have all to partake of his Gifts. Thoſe therefore that receive ſhall give an account to God, why they received it, and to what end. And ſuch as feigned themſelves to be poor that they might receive the Charity of others, ſhall be called to a ſtrict account for it, but the giver ſhall be judged innocent. For by giving univerſally and without difference to all, he fulfilled the Truſt committed to him by God, and did it* SIMPLY *and to God's Glory.* The Greek words are thus ſet down by *Antiochus*, *Hom.* 98. tho perhaps with ſome alteration. Καλὸν ὂν ἐστι ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κόπων, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπηύξησε, πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως παρέχειν ΑΠΛΩΣ, μηδὲν διακρίνοντα, τίνι δῷς. Πᾶσι γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς δίδωσι δῶρα, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δωρημάτων, κ᾽ μὴ ΔΙΑΚΡΙΝΑΙ τίνι δῷ, τίνι μὴ δῷ. Ἡ γὰρ δικαιία ΑΠΛΩΣ πλουτεῖται, ἵνα δῷ ὑπάρχει παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Καὶ ὅπως ἁπλοῦς δικαιοῦν, τῷ Θεῷ ζήσεται. Several other Paſſages might be produced out of the Antients to the ſame purpoſe. See Lib. 3. *Conſtit. Apoſtol.* cap. 4.

Ibid. Ἐν ἱλαρότητι.] Partly becauſe that *chearfulneſs* diſcovers a truly liberal diſpoſition of Mind, it being natural to Men to be chearful in following their own Inclinations, and partly becauſe it makes the benefit ſeem the greater to him that receives it, if it be beſtowed chearfully. See *Seneca de Beneficiis*, Lib. 2. cap. 4.

Chapter XII.

Verſ. 11. *Note* b. This conjecture of Dr. *Hammond* is favoured by the ſeries of the diſcourſe, in which it is not probable that among particular Precepts the Apoſtle would bring in that general one, comprehending all the duties of a Chriſtian's Life, of *ſerving the Lord*. Beſides, after the words πνεύματι ζέοντες, it very aptly follows καιρῷ δουλεύοντες, and both together make up an excellent Precept to this ſenſe: "In the buſineſs of Piety you muſt be zealous and fervent, but yet ſo as "to obſerve the proper time for it, leſt by your unſeaſonable fervor "you ſhould bring your ſelves into danger without doing any body "elſe any good. The Apoſtle here makes uſe of a known Proverb, and ordinary both in Greek and Latin Authors. So *Phocylides*:

Καιρῷ λατρεύειν, μὴτ' ἀντιπνέειν ἀνέμοισι.

We muſt ſerve the ſeaſon, and not blow againſt the Winds. So *Cicero* de *Finibus*, Lib. 3. *num.* 73. among other Precepts of the antient Sages ſets down this, *tempori parere*, for one. So the Author of the Panegyrick *ad Piſonem*:

Temporibus ſervire decet, qui tempora certis
Ponderibus penſavit, eum ſi bella vocabunt,
Miles erit; ſi pax, poſitis toga geſtiet armis.
Hunc fora pacatum, bellantem caſtra decebunt.

It's true, in St. *Paul*, the ſenſe is ſomething different, but it is ſufficient if it have but an affinity with that which it is commonly taken in; for ſuch ſort of ſayings have generally more ſenſes than one. Which the Tranſcribers of the New Teſtament not ſufficiently underſtanding, and knowing that this Proverb was ſometimes uſed in an ill ſenſe, for *hypocritical time ſerving*, changed καιρῷ into κυρίῳ. This is much more probable than that the word κυρίῳ was changed into καιρῷ, or the Phraſe *to ſerve the Lord* ſo very common in theſe Books, into one leſs uſual, *to ſerve the time*.

Ver. 15. *Note* c. Tho *Grotius* alſo, as well as our Author, ſuppoſes this Verſe to have a reference to the two Gates of the Temple, yet I am not of their opinion, nor do I think the *Apoſtle* had any particular reſpect here to excommunicated Perſons. The words are *general*, and contain an excellent general Precept to all Chriſtians, to endeavour to get the Love and Friendſhip of thoſe with whom they live, nothing being more pleaſing to Men than to ſee others ſympathize with them in their Afflictions, and rejoice at their Proſperity. I know they are for the moſt

most part Flatterers and Hypocrites that practiſe this; but then it is not for *that* that they are to be condemned, but their hypocriſy in pretending to grieve or rejoice at what happens to others when they really do not, but have other Ends and Deſigns. But a good Man alſo not only may, but ought to be truly affected with others Proſperity or Adverſity. I am apt to think alſo that St. *Paul* here rather made uſe of a common proverbial form of Speech, than a new phraſe not before heard of. We meet with the like expreſſion, tho to another purpoſe, in *Horace* de Arte Poetica: Chapter XIII.

Ut ridentibus arrident, ita flentibus adflent
Humani vultus.

Adflent, for ſo the word muſt be read, according to the opinion of learned Men, not *adſunt*. Of the thing it ſelf ſee *Stobæi Florileg.* Tit. 113, and 115.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. Col. 1. *Lin.* 21. After the words, *avenger of Wrath.*] I don't well underſtand what our Author meant, in taking ſo much pains to prove that ἐξουσία Power ſignifies the *perſon of the Ruler or Magiſtrate*; for who would have ever queſtion'd it? But perhaps his deſign was to ſhew that the ἐξουσία or governing Power was ſo confined by God to ſome particular Perſons or Families, that it could never paſs from them. Which is true, where the Kingly or any other Power, according to the cuſtom of the Country, deſcends by Succeſſion to the next Heir, and that Cuſtom cannot be altered without great danger. But where the Cuſtom is otherwiſe, as it was in the *Roman* Empire, in the time of St. *Paul*, I do not ſee the uſe of what our Author here ſays: For it is known, that the ſupreme Power was not confined to any one Family in *Rome*, but belonged to thoſe whom the Army elected.

Ibid. *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 4. After the words *Fideni* or *Gabii.*] Our learned Author miſquotes here the words of *Juvenal*, and puts *Fidenorum Gabiorumque*, inſtead of *Fidenarum Gabiorumque*, which for want of ſufficient skill in the Roman Antiquities, he ſeems to have taken for the names of two People; whereas *Fidenæ* was the place where *Juvenal* wrote; and every Child that has read but the firſt Book of *Livy*, knows that *Fidenæ* and *Gabii* were two *Cities* of that name, whereof the People were called *Fidenates* and *Gabini*, not *Fideni* and *Gabii*.

Chapter XIII.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] The Verb ὑπερέχειν signifies no more than ἔχειν τι ὑπέρ τινα, *to have ſomething that another hath not*, to excel or be eminent in any thing; and ſo may be applied, not only to that which is in its kind and order *ſupreme*, but alſo to that which in any thing whatſoever excels others deſtitute of it. Thus in the *Old Gloſſes* ὑπερέχω is rendred by *exſto, emineo, excello, præcello, exſupero, antecello*; all ſignifying *to excel*: ὑπερέχει, *eminet, exiſtit*: ὑπερέχον, *exſtans, excellens.* ὑπερέχουσι therefore here is rendred rightly by the Vulgar *ſublimioribus.* The Powers here meant, are the Emperor, and all the other Roman Magiſtrates, who ὑπερέχον, *were* at that time *ſuperior* to all the Princes of the Nations contained within the bounds of the Roman Empire. And theſe Powers were all *from God*; not that God had conferred a greater or a leſs degree of Power to *this* or *that* perſon *immediatly*, but becauſe it being the Will of God that men ſhould form themſelves into political Societies, and live peaceably with one another, he is ſaid, upon that account, to will alſo that there ſhould be Magiſtrates, both ſupreme and ſubordinate; becauſe there can be no *Commonwealth*, nor any *Peace* kept without Government. And this being ſo, whenever any one, either with the conſent of the People, or by an ὑπεροχὴ, *ſuperiority* of ſtrength ſeizes upon the Government, provided we may live peaceably under it, we ought to be ſubject to him for the ſake of the Commonwealth, and conſequently of *God's Ordinance*, and of *Conſcience.* So did the Chriſtians under the Heathen Emperors; and ſo did alſo the wiſeſt men among the Heathens.

Verſ. 6. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε.] *viz.* Becauſe it is but juſt that thoſe who employ themſelves in the ſervice and defence of the Commonwealth, ſhould be furniſhed for all neceſſary expences. This being a neceſſary conſequent of Society, God who will have men live in Society, muſt accordingly be ſuppoſed to require the paying of Tribute to its Governors. In which nevertheleſs the Laws always are to be regarded which appoint that Tribute: For this Reward given to the Magiſtrate for ſerving the Community, is conſtituted by Men, not by God *immediatly*; tho it ought not therefore to be accounted the leſs ſacred, becauſe in this particular of requiring Tribute, men act according to the Notions they have received from God, by the very Conſtitution of human Nature. This is what St. *Paul* means, and not that God has *immediatly* ordained either *Kings*, or the paiment of *Tribute* to them, as our *Author* ſeems to think, which no one would ſay concerning the *Roman* Emperors, and the Tribute paid to *them.*

Verſ.

Verſ. 9. Τὸ γὰρ ἀ μοιχεύσεις, &c.] As it is very certain to me that Honor is due to Kings, and none but ſeditious perſons can make a queſtion of it; ſo I cannot tell whether any one can prove that the fifth Commandment requires us to pay that Honor which is due to Magiſtrates. There is the ſame reaſon indeed for both; but they are not required in the ſame Precept. See what I have written on the beginning of the *Decalogue*, in my *Comment* on *Exod.* xx. Chapter XIV.

Verſ. 13. *Note* e. All this, *Plautus*'s Interpreters, and the Greek Lexicographers had obſerved a great while before our Author. But what is the meaning of *lotis* in the laſt Verſe he cites out of *Plautus*? Perhaps it is a falſe print for *lotus*: The ordinary reading is thus;

Tute tibi puer es lautus, luces cereum.

Which needs no alteration. See *Taubmannus* on that place.

CHAP. XIV.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. OUR Learned *Author*, on *Matth.* xv. 19. took abundance of pains to affix a ſenſe upon the word διαλογισμοὺς, which does not belong to it in that place. And ſo he does here to as little purpoſe; for tho διαλογισμὸς may ſignify that reaſoning which reſpects the regulation of a man's Life, yet that is not the literal importance of the word, which ſignifies any other ſort of reaſoning equally with that.

II. In *Epicurus* his *Epiſt.* to *Idomeneus*, διαλογισμοὶ ſignifies all the Inventions and Diſputations of that Philoſopher, of what kind ſoever they were, which he had committed to writing, and the remembrance of which ſo much refreſhed him. Λογισμὸς in his *Epiſt.* to *Menæceus*, is another thing, and ſignifies the act of reaſoning it ſelf. Hence *Cicero* (not in Lib. 5. *Tuſcul. Quæſt.* but *de Finibus* Lib. 2. Cap. 30. where he recites that whole Epiſtle) renders διαλογισμὸς by *rationes & inventa*, *Reaſons and Inventions*. As for St. *Ambroſe*, who did not deſign to be extraordinary exact in rendring that word, his Authority can ſignify nothing.

III. In this place I take διαλογισμοὶ to ſignify a *Speculation*, or *Opinion conceived in the Mind*, and the meaning of the Apoſtle to be, that thoſe among them who were more knowing and intelligent, ought to receive and treat the ignorant with all mildneſs, tho weak in the Faith; that is, tho having a leſs degree of knowledg and underſtanding in Chriſti-

Chapter XIV.

Christianity, they differed from them in their *Opinions*. So that μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν, will be equivalent to ἄνευ διακρίσεως διαλογισμῶν, *without discrimination of Opinions*. The Judaizing Christian was to be received and entertained with as much affection by those that understood their liberty better, as if he did not Judaize. It is plain διάκρισις signifies *discrimination* in 1 *Cor.* xii. 10. and *Heb.* v. 14. And διαλογισμοὶ are the reasonings of the Philosophers, in *Chap.* i. 2. of this Epistle, on which their Opinions or Errors were grounded.

Vers. 4. Στήκει ἢ πίπτει.] *H. Grotius* has observed before the *Doctor*, that the phrase *to stand or fall*, signifies to be acquitted or condemned; and that the Latins say, *cadere causa*. We have an Example of both in this one Verse of *Ovid*, in Lib. *Fastorum*, where speaking to *Germanicus*, he saith:

Ingenium vultu statque caditque tuo.

That is, according as you receive this Work, favourably or otherwise, my Wit will find its endeavours either *condemned* or *approved*.

Vers. 12. Λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ.] This Verse is strangely paraphrased by the *Doctor*; for what occasion was there here to say any thing about the Power of the Keys? any thing else might as well have been found out in this place.

Vers. 15. *Note* c. 1. The following words shew that λυπεῖσθαι signifies something more in this place, than barely *to be grieved*, as Dr. *Hammond* well observes, *viz.* to be prejudiced and alienated by that grief from the Christian Religion, which is the Notion of ἀπόλλυσθαι *to perish*, or *be destroyed*. But the reasons he gives for this signification are not only forced, but also in part contrary to what he endeavours to prove. In one word, he might have shewn us what he meant, if he had said that the *Antecedent* was put here by a *Metonymy* for the *Consequent*, λύπη or λυπεῖσθαι, for the effect of that grief, *i. e.* for a defection from the Christian Religion. By a like figure the words *to love* and *hate* signify the effects of those Passions, as in that famous place in *Malach.* i. 2, 3. Jacob *have I loved, and* Esau *have I hated*; that is, I have confer'd those benefits upon *Jacob*, which I never bestowed upon *Esau*. See other Examples of the same, in *Sal. Glassius Rhet. Sacr.* Tract. 1. Cap. 1. On the contrary, our Author produces Examples wherein the *Effect* is put for the *Cause*; which are nothing to the purpose, the *Cause* here being put for the *Effect*.

2. It is yet less to the purpose, what he says about the Conjugation *Hiphil*, and its being rendred in Greek by a Verb Active. For that which

which is used here is a Verb Passive, which is taken for the effect of that which it properly signifies. Besides, he confounds Nouns with Verbs, and Verbs with Nouns, as if they were all one; and is hard put to it to extricate himself out of the maze of his perplexed reasoning. He had said afterwards that "אבר *which signifies* destruction, "*and is often rendered by* ἀπώλεια, *is, in* Prov. xxxi. 6. *rendred* λύπη, οἱ "ὀδυνῶντες; Just as if אבר *abad* were a Noun, and in the place of *Proverbs* were not the *Participle* אובד *obed*, *perishing*, but a *Noun*. Chapter XIV.

Vers. 17. *Note* d. The most simple and natural sense of this *Verse* seems to be this: "That which Christ, who is our King, requires of "us, does not consist in abstaining from meat or drink, but in living "righteously, peaceably, and chearfully under the sense of those Gifts "of the Holy Ghost which we have received from God; and therefore we should endeavour to follow after Righteousness and Peace, "and not be morose towards others who do not abstain from the "Meats forbidden by the Law. Χαρὰ here properly signifies *chearfulness* or *pleasantness*, in opposition to the *moroseness* of the *Jews*, who could not look upon those who ate of all sorts of Meats indifferently without frowning. The same word signifies *Joy*, in *Gal.* v. 22. which is reckoned among the Fruits of a Gospel-Spirit, and comprehends both that affection of mind which I have described, and that behaviour towards our Neighbour which proceeds from it, and which consists in living and conversing with him in a friendly manner. And this amicable disposition and behaviour St. *Paul* recommends elsewhere, as in 1 *Thess.* v. 16. where he exhorts Christians *to rejoice always*; or, as it is in *Phil.* iv. 4. *to rejoice in the Lord always*, that is, for the Benefits they have received from the Lord. This Joy, as it shews that we are satisfied with our condition, so in all our transactions with our Neighbour it clearly discovers it self, in the courteousness and affableness of our behaviour towards him. Whereas on the contrary men who are discontented with the condition they are in, as they want this Joy, so they are generally rugged and morose in their deportment. Of which number were the *Jews*, who were very much offended at the approaching destruction of their Temple, and could not upon any terms be friends with the *Gentiles*, who did not observe the difference between Meats prescribed by the Law. It is truly said of such a man by *Amphis* in Florileg. *Stobæi*, Tit. 99.

——Ὡς δυσάρεστόν ἐσ' ἀνυμφῶν
Ἄνθρωπος, ἢν ἄπαντ' ἀπῇ τι δυσχερῶς ἔχῃ.

Chapter XV. *How ingrateful a thing is a penſive diſcontented Man! in every thing he carries himſelf moroſely.*

Verſ. 23. Πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.] *i. e.* Whatever we do, not knowing whether it is lawful or not, is a Sin, becauſe it proceeds from a Mind careleſs of the lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of Actions. This *Philo Judæus* has expreſſed almoſt in the ſame words as St. *Paul*, in Lib. *de Profugis*, pag. 336. where after he had given an allegorical interpretation of *Abraham*'s Sacrifice, he ſubjoins that, ἄριστον ἱερεῖον ἀναιμία καὶ ἐπιχῇ περὶ ὧν οὐκ εἰσὶ πίστεις: *The beſt Sacrifice is Forbearance and Abſtinence, in things about which we have no certain Faith.*

Ibid. *Note* c. Our learned Author had no reaſon to ſpeak of the *Poſthumous Notes of Grotius*, as if he doubted whether they were *genuin* or not. They were committed to the care of *Joan. Mercerus*, who publiſhed them very faithfully; nor did any of *Grotius*'s Family ever complain that they were not faithfully publiſhed. I ſpeak this, becauſe I know Dr. *Hammond* has elſewhere, for no reaſon, call'd into queſtion the fidelity of that honeſt Man. Nor indeed is there any thing here or elſewhere in thoſe *Notes* unworthy of *Grotius*, tho there may be ſome things in them liable to cenſure, as there are in his other works, and in all the Writings almoſt of all other Men.

However it is well ſhewn by the *Doctor* out of St. *Paul* himſelf, that Doxologies are not only uſed by way of *Concluſion:* Which may be confirmed by the inſtance of St. *Clement*, one of St. *Paul*'s Diſciples, who has the like *Doxologies* more than once in his *1ſt Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians*. See the end of *Cap.* 20. and what *Patric. Junius* has obſerved on that place, and *Cap.* 58.

CHAP. XV.

Verſ. 3. Οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ.] In this Citation we have an inſtance of what I obſerved on *Chap.* ix. 28. that when any paſſages of Scripture are cited, the connexion of the Diſcourſe is generally neglected. For the ſenſe here is imperfect, and muſt be made up by the Reader thus, or to this purpoſe: "*For even Chriſt did not pleaſe himſelf*, but was very careful to avoid "every thing that might prejudice the weak, and did not give his "own Judgment that free liberty that he might have done, for fear of "giving them an occaſion to blaſpheme againſt God, which he was as "careful to ſhun as if thoſe Blaſphemies had fallen upon himſelf; ſo "that it may be juſtly ſaid of him, *The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me.* It is certain Chriſt might have ſaid a great many things

things as to the abrogation of the Law of *Moſes*, and the calling of the *Gentiles*, which afterwards he revealed to the Apoſtles, and by the Apoſtles to others; he might have gone before them himſelf by his example, in neglecting the vain Ceremonies of the Law, and converſing freely with the Heathens, which undoubtedly would have been more ἀρέσκοντα *grateful* and *pleaſing* to him than to hold his peace, becauſe the *Apoſtles* could not *as yet* bear what he had to ſay, and much leſs the reſt of the *Jews*; or to avoid the ſociety of the *Heathens* as polluted Perſons, who would more readily have believed on him than the *Jews*, leſt he ſhould give theſe latter an occaſion to blaſpheme the Chriſtian Religion, which was then but in its infancy. This is the ſenſe, if I am not miſtaken, of this place, which our Author did not ſufficiently underſtand. Chapter XV.

Verſ. 4. Ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, &c.] Here alſo there muſt be ſomething ſupplied to this purpoſe. "Theſe words of the *Pſalmiſt* ſhew you "what it is your duty to do in endeavouring to avoid giving any "occaſion to Men to blaſpheme Religion: *For whatever things were* "*written*, &c. The deſpiſing of the ſcruples of the weak was a thing of very dangerous conſequence, becauſe it might alienate their Minds from Chriſtianity, and make them turn Apoſtates and Blaſphemers, and ſo expoſe it alſo to the contempt of Infidels, when they ſaw it forſaken by them that had firſt of all embraced it, and that the Chriſtians were divided amongſt themſelves.

Verſ. 8. Διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς.] That is, preached only to the Circumciſed; which our learned Author has not clearly enough expreſſed in his Paraphraſe. See *Grotius*.

Verſ. 12. *Note* a. Thoſe which are here called ἔθνη, and in the Prophet *People* and *Nations*, are literally the *Tribes* of *Iſrael*, as will appear to any one that compares the 10th *verſe*, out of which the Apoſtle cites this Paſſage, with the following *verſes*. But as under the perſon of *Hezekiah* is deſcribed the *Meſſias*, ſo by the *Jews* and their *ſeveral Tribes* are repreſented all the Nations throughout the World, that ſhould believe on the *Meſſias*. And the *Jews*, in St. *Paul*'s time, generally took thoſe Paſſages to belong to the *Meſſias*, and therefore they are here fitly urged.

But our Author is miſtaken when he ſuppoſes the power of making War, which belongs only to him that is ſupreme, is here referred to; for *Iſaiah* does not ſpeak of *making War*, but of bringing back the *Iſraelites* that were diſperſed in the neighbouring Countries in *Judæa*, of which he ſays that *Hezekiah* ſhould be an *Enſign*: See *Iſa.* xiii. 2.

Chapter XVI.

It is a Metaphor indeed taken from Military Affairs, becauſe at the ſetting up of an *Enſign* Souldiers uſe to gather together, but the power of making War is not alluded to. Nor had the *Septuagint* any ſuch thing as that in their thoughts when they tranſlated this Paſſage, but only for נֵס *Ines, for an Enſign*, read, or thought it ought to be read נָשִׂיא *for a Prince*; by which the ſenſe is not much alter'd, becauſe the ſame Perſon that was to be a *Prince*, was alſo to ſet up an *Enſign*.

Verſ. 16. Ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.] Two ways any Offering might be ſaid to be ſanctified; *firſt*, by him that determined to offer up any Sacrifice to God, and delivered it already conſecrated in his Mind to the Prieſt to be actually offer'd up: and *2dly*, when it was placed upon the Altar, which ſanctified, *i. e.* made it to be eſteemed Sacred whatever that touched: See *Exod.* xxix. 37. and *Mat.* xxiii. 19. This I ſuppoſe, the Apoſtle here has a reference to, rather than, as the *Doctor*, to the *Prieſts*, or as *Grotius*, to *Salt*; and that by πνεῦμα ἅγιον are meant the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, whereby the *Gentiles*, after they had believed, were conſecrated to God as by the ſacred fire of the Altar. See *Acts* x.

Verſ. 21. Οἷς μὴ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, &c.] To underſtand here Dr. *Hammond*'s Paraphraſe, we muſt read *Grotius* on this place, and on *Iſa.* lii. where he interprets the words of the Prophet as ſpoken primarily of *Jeremiah*, and ſecondarily of *Chriſt*, *forcedly* indeed in my opinion. But I have not room here to diſcuſs that matter: I ſhall only remark, that St. *Paul* might very pertinently alledg this Prediction, ſpeaking of the calling of the *Gentiles*, becauſe it was commonly ſuppoſed to have a reference to the *Meſſias*.

Verſ. 31. Ἀπιθούντων.] This Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphraſe interprets of the judaizing *Chriſtians*; but I think it ought rather to be interpreted of the *unbelieving Jews*, whom St. *Paul* had moſt reaſon to be afraid of, as the thing it ſelf ſhews.

CHAP. XVI.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. IT is very true that in the *New Teſtament* διακονεῖν ſignifies to ſupply the poor with neceſſaries, and διακονία *liberality*; but it does not appear from any example that any one was therefore called either ſimply διάκονος or διάκονος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. No Grecian ever ſpake in that manner, to ſignify a Woman that was liberal to the poor of any Church, out of her own ſubſtance. So that it

it is much more probable a *Deaconeſs* is here meant, as the Chriſtians afterwards uſed to ſpeak, which had the overſight of the publick Alms of the Church, and performed perhaps other Offices in it. Not all it may be then that have ſince been attributed to them, but there were undoubtedly in thoſe Primitive times Deaconeſſes, which adminiſtred ſeveral things relating to the Church; as appears both by this place, and by an Epiſtle of *Pliny* to *Trajan*, wherein he makes mention of ſuch *miniſtræ* (ſo he calls them) among the Chriſtians. On which paſſage *Ger. Voſſius* has put together almoſt all that belongs to that Office, as *Joan. Bapt. Cotelerius* has alſo done on ſeveral places of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*. See particularly on *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 15. Chapter XVI.

I wonder Dr. *Hammond*, when he had *Grotius* to go before him, did not rather keep to this, than ſay things which are nothing to the purpoſe: For it is no where ſaid that *Phœbe* accompanied any of the Apoſtles, and what is affirmed of ſuch Women is very ſuſpicious. For it is true, certain rich Women did ſometimes follow *Chriſt*, but this ſeems neither to have been conſtant, nor ever practiſed in great Journeys, when the longeſt were from *Galilee* to *Jeruſalem*, and that at the time of the Feaſts, in which Women otherwiſe uſed to go up to that City. But that in the journeys which the Apoſtles made into *far diſtant* Countries, they had rich Women to accompany them, and ſupply them with neceſſaries, which might otherwiſe have been more eaſily and decently done, let *them* believe who uſe to give credit to all that the Antients affirm, without the leaſt appearance of likelihood. It were eaſy to ſhew the improbability of it, and I ſhall ſay ſomething to that purpoſe on 1 *Cor.* ix. 5.

Verſ. 7. Ἐν Χριστῷ.] That is, *Chriſtians*, as I obſerved on *Chap.* xii. 5. See there.

Verſ. 16. *Note* c. It is uncertain whether St. *Paul* here had a reſpect to that Salutation which the Chriſtians us'd to give to one another in their holy Aſſemblies; nay it is very *improbable*, and that for theſe two reaſons. *Firſt*, becauſe the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of ſuch a Salutation as was given by Friends in the room of their Friends, to perſons whom they deſired in a Letter to be ſaluted in their name; which Salutation has nothing common with that Church-ſalutation. *Secondly*, in the Church where Men and Women ſat apart from one another, the Men were ſaluted by the Men, and the Women by the Women; not promiſcuouſly the Men by the Women, or the Women by the Men. The Author of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, Lib. 2. c. 57. where he ſets down the whole order obſerved in the Chriſtian Aſſem-

Chapter XVI.

blies, deſcribes that Cuſtom thus: ἅπα ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀλλήλους οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀλλήλας αἱ γυναῖκες, τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα: *Then let the Men ſalute one another, and the Women one another, with a kiſs in the Lord.* He had ſaid before: εἰς τὸ ὕπερον μέρος οἱ λαϊκοὶ καθεζέσθωσαν, μετὰ πάσης ἡσυχίας καὶ εὐταξίας, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες κεκοσμημέναι καὶ αὗται καθεζέσθωσαν, σιωπὴν ἄγουσαι: *Let the Laicks ſit on one ſide in all quietneſs and good order; and the Women alſo ſit apart by themſelves, keeping ſilence.* I know there were ſeveral alterations made in the Order of the Church in the following Age, but thus in all probability it was antiently, not only becauſe of the decency of it, but alſo becauſe it is certain this was the Cuſtom among the *Jews*, whom in many things the Primitive Church followed, as *J. Bapt. Cotelerius* on this place in the *Conſtit.* Num. 32. *Edit. Amſt.* has well obſerved.

Verſ. 17. Τὰς παὰ διχοστασίας, &c.] At the end of the *Premonition* to this Epiſtle, I ſaid I did not think that the *Gnoſticks* were referred to whereever Dr. *Hammond* thought ſo; but I did not deny that ſometimes the reproofs of the Apoſtles might belong to them, as theſe do in this place. They were ſubtil crafty Perſons, who perceiving that a great many had embraced the Chriſtian Religion, who were very liberal to the poor of that Profeſſion, and ready to hearken to any that made a ſhew of Piety and Learning, took occaſion to deceive the ſimple, that they might live idly at their coſt, and privately indulge themſelves in all manner of Senſuality: Of which number ſeems to have been that *Peregrinus*, whoſe death is related by *Lucian*, if we may give credit to an *Epicurean* and an Orator. And to theſe Hereticks ſeem to be owing that multitude of ſuppoſititious Writings which were received and uſed by the Chriſtians ever ſince the firſt Ages, and thoſe Philoſophical Opinions with which Chriſtianity was very early corrupted, and were taken by the ignorant and unwary for Apoſtolical Doctrines. See *Col.* ii. 8. and 2 *Tim.* iii. 2, &c.

Verſ. 20. Συντρίψει ὁ Σατανᾶς.] Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphraſe puts *ſeveral* things together, to ſhew the full importance of this Phraſe. But I believe it has a reference *only* to the *perſecuting Jews*, who waged an irreconcileable War with the Chriſtians as Apoſtates: For theſe being the inſtruments of the Devil, who is called κατ' ἐξοχὴν *Satan*, or *an Adverſary*, and by his inſpiration endeavouring to oppreſs the Chriſtian Religion at its firſt riſe, could not be deſtroyed, but Satan muſt be *trod under foot* as it were, at the ſame time. The Heathens had not as yet begun to perſecute the Chriſtians for Religions ſake, but only under the notion of *ſeditious* Perſons, by which name

name the *Jews* endeavour'd to defame them amongst the *Romans*, as appears from the History of the *Acts*. So that the Christians had no Adversaries at that time but the *Jews*; who having some years after become odious themselves to the *Romans* upon the account of their Seditions, were not in a condition to do the Christians any great harm. And that seems to be the reason why St. *Paul* promised the Christians peace ἐν τάχει *shortly*, from the *God of Peace*. What the *Doctor* says here besides this, is besides the meaning of the Apostle: *That* about the silencing of the Oracles is perhaps false; and it is certain *Satan* ceased not to stir up the Heathens for some Ages after against the Christians. Chapter XVI.

ANNO-

Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to the *Corinthians.*

CHAP. I.

Vers. 5. *Note* b. IT is easily discernible, that all Dr. *Hammond* says in this Annotation are mere Niceties, which have no foundation in *Grammar*, but depend upon bare reasoning, every part of which almost may be denied. Nor is it needful to confute it all particularly. It is much more natural, both here and in 2 *Cor.* viii. 7. by the word λόγῳ to understand the knowledg of Religion; which the Apostle *Paul* calls λόγον in the same sense that the Latins call Learning *litteras*, and the Greeks *litteras* λόγους, as every one knows, or if they do not, they soon may by the *Lexicons*. Ἐν πάντι λόγῳ therefore signifies *in all knowledg*; that which relates, for instance, to the interpretation of Prophecies, that which concerns the speculative part of Religion, and that which respects the government of the Life. Nor is it any objection against this Interpretation, that hereby γνῶσις and λόγῳ are made to signify the same thing, nothing being more common than for synonimous words to be joined together. But see also Dr. *Hammond*'s next Annotation.

Vers. 15. Εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.] That is, that they might be called my Disciples, or receive a denomination from me, and be stiled *Paulites*. See my *Note* on *Mat.* xxviii. 16.

Vers. 20. *Note* f. What our Author says on this place, is certainly very ingenious; and some things he has transcribed out of *Grotius* so as to mend, and add to them. But if we consider, we shall find that the Prophet *Isaiah* is cited as a *Witness* to the Gospel only in *ver.* 19. out of *Chap.* xxix. 14. and that the following words in *ver.* 20. are taken by St. *Paul* out of *Isa.* xxxiii. 18. not to *prove* any thing, but only express his mind by them as his own words. Just as the Greeks and Latins frequently borrow passages out of their own *Poets*, not to

to prove any thing by their Authority, but to expreſs their mind in *their* words more elegantly than they could do in their *own*; and to the ſame end likewiſe the Hebrews frequently alledg the words of the *Old Teſtament*. And as the Greeks and Latins make no difficulty of applying the ſayings of their Poets to a different purpoſe than they intended them, provided they do not apply them abſurdly; the ſame is obſervable alſo among the Hebrews: Of which there are innumerable Inſtances to be met with in the *Talmudiſts*, and the myſtical Interpreters of the Scripture; and before them in *Philo*, who ſeldom ever cites the Scripture but in that manner. And this being a uſual practice in the time of the Apoſtles, it is no wonder if *they* followed the cuſtom of the Age wherein they lived, there being no harm at all in that cuſtom. A very remarkable inſtance of ſuch a Citation we have in *Rom.* x. where the diſcourſe is about the Righteouſneſs of the Goſpel. But thoſe paſſages are carefully to be diſtinguiſhed from others, by which any thing is *proved*, or any *concluſion* drawn from them. I don't think St. *Paul* did ſo ſubtilly examin the agreement of the words of *Iſaiah* with what he deſigned to ſay, as Dr. *Hammond*.

Chapter II.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. WHAT our Author ſays here about the ſeveral Arguments that might be uſed to procure credit to the Goſpel, is all very true and undeniable; but the greateſt part of it is beſides the ſcope of this place: For by πνεῦμα here is meant only the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, which were uſed by thoſe who are called πνευματικοὶ in this very *Chapter*, in the Church; as the *Gift of Tongues*, which was no ſmall evidence of the truth of Chriſtianity. *Achaia* at that time being a place of great commerce, a great many *Jews* and *Gentiles*, out of *Africa*, *Egypt*, and other places where the Inhabitants were βαρβαροφωνοι, if I may ſo ſpeak, reſorted to it. And theſe could not hear the Apoſtle ſpeaking properly in their ſeveral Languages without the higheſt admiration, knowing that he had never learned them. See *Chap.* xii. of this Epiſtle, where the word *Spirit* often ſignifies ſuch Gifts. And by δύναμις, as *Grotius* rightly obſerves, is meant the Gift of *healing Diſeaſes*, or the like. See the ſame Chapter, *verſ.* 10, 28, 29. St. *Paul*'s meaning therefore is, that he did not come to the *Corinthians* as a Philoſopher, to perſwade them to believe what he ſaid by argument and reaſoning, but endued with miraculous Gifts, ſuch as the Gift of Tongues and the like, and a power of curing the diſeaſed; that the credit they

Chapter II. gave to him might not be as to a Philoſopher, who confirmed the truth of his Doctrin by probable reaſons, but as to God's Meſſenger, demonſtrating by Miracles that he had a Command from Heaven to ſay what he preached to them, and did not diſcover it by reaſoning.

The Arguments for the truth of the Chriſtian Religion taken from Prophecies, which *Grotius* and our Author would have to be partly here intended, were not ἀποδείξεις *demonſtrations* to any but the *Jews*, who had already fixed a certain ſenſe upon them, and believed them; but they could not in the leaſt move the *Heathens*. The reſt alſo were not ἀποδείξεις, diſtinct from *reaſonings*, but to thoſe that had *ſeen them*: It is *preſent* Miracles that are here meant, whereby the Apoſtle, without any long arguing, proved ἀποδεικτικῶς, that he was ſent from God. Our Author in his Paraphraſe on this Chapter, puts in ſo many things foreign to the ſenſe of St. *Paul*'s words, that it is rather *he* himſelf than the *Apoſtle* that reaſons in it.

Verſ. 5. Δυνάμει Θεοῦ.] That is, the Power of God; from which he received an ability to work δυνάμεις. This word in the foregoing Verſe ſignifies the *effect* of the divine Power, but here the divine *Power* it ſelf which was the cauſe of thoſe Miracles. That Faith which relies upon Miracles wrought by a divine Power, relies upon the divine Power *it ſelf* by which thoſe Miracles are wrought. Dr. *Hammond* here, according to his manner, makes a difficulty where there is none.

Verſ. 6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν, &c.] This *Verſe* ſhould be paraphraſed thus: "All that throughly underſtand what is true Wiſdom, will eaſily "perceive that the Goſpel is ſo. It is not, I confeſs, ſuch Wiſdom "as that of Philoſophers or Orators, who by their ſubtilty and "eloquence render themſelves ſo acceptable to the great Men of the "World, which Wiſdom is made vain by the preaching of the Goſ-"pel. Σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος is Philoſophical Learning, which is vain in the account of thoſe that are *perfect*, or that throughly know what it is to be wiſe, as Chriſtians do. And by *the Wiſdom of the Princes of the Age* ſeems to be meant *Eloquence*, which in that Age the Nobility of *Rome* did diligently ſtudy, as appears by both the *Seneca's*, *Quintilian*, both the *Pliny's*, and others. Ἀρχόντων I render the *Nobility*, to make that word comprehend, not only the Roman Emperors, but alſo leſſer Powers, ſuch as the Preſidents or Governors of Provinces.

Ibid. Καταργουμένων.] This word is not to be referred to the *Authority* of the Roman Magiſtrates, which at that time prevailed, and *afterwards* continued, but to their *Wiſdom* or *Learning*, which was *vain* and

and *empty*, becauſe it could not make them *happy*, or lead them to the knowledg of the true Religion. Chapter II.

Verſ. 8. Ἀρχόντων τῦ αἰῶνΘ.] I don't think this Phraſe ſignifies the chief Men among the *Jews*, excluding the *Heathen* Magiſtrates; or theſe latter only, and not the *Jews*. For both may be intended, it being manifeſt that ſome multitude is deſigned in this expreſſion: NONE *of the Princes of this Age*, &c.

Verſ. 11. Πνεύματα πνεύματικοῖς συγκρίνοντες.] That is, to *ſpiritual Men* ſpeaking *ſpiritual* things. For that after πνεύματικοῖς we are to ſupply ἀνθρώποις, appears by the next Verſe, where the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπΟς is oppoſed to them: And *ſpiritual* things are ſuch as agree with the ſpiritual Nature of the Goſpel, according to the uſual notion of that word; not Arguments deduced from Prophecies, which πνεύματα is no where elſe uſed to ſignify: this appears further from the following Verſe, which makes me wonder that both *Grotius*, and Dr. *Hammond* who follows him, ſhould talk here of Prophecies, of which St. *Paul* does not ſpeak one ſyllable in this place.

Verſ. 14. Ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπΟς ὁ Νήχεται.] I don't think that by ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπΟς here is meant a Man that makes uſe of nothing but reaſon, as our Author ſuppoſes, after *Grotius*; ſuch a Man ſhould rather have been ſtiled λογικὸς, for *reaſon* is called λόγΟς not ψυχή. I rather think it ſignifies a Man who is no more raiſed in his Mind to ſpiritual things than any other ἔμψυχον *living Creature*, i. e. than Plants and Animals. Perhaps *Plants* were called ψυχαὶ, but at leaſt *Animals* were ſtiled ſo in Greek at that time, in imitation of the Latins, ſo that ψυχικὸν & ζῶον were all one. And to this the *old Gloſſes* ſeem to have a reference, which interpret ψυχαὶ by *animalia*, & ψυχικὸς by *animalis*. It is certain ψυχὴ is frequently taken for that life which is common to us with *Brutes*. Ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος therefore is a Phraſe uſed by way of contempt to ſignify a Perſon that is wholly devoted and enſlaved to earthly things, and entirely taken up with the concernments of this Life, like a brute Creature: As on the other hand πνεῦμα ſignifies the *Mind* or reaſonable Soul, which is peculiar to Men, and capable of diſcerning and *aſſenting* to πνεύματα *ſpiritual things*. The Verb Νήχεσθαι ſignifies here *to aſſent*, in the notion it is more than once met with in *Thucydides*, as *H. Stephanus* will inform us. Tho there is no need of *Thucydides*'s authority, it being often ſo taken in the *New Teſtament*, as in *Mat.* xi. 14. where *Chriſt* ſpeaking to the multitude concerning *John* the *Baptiſt*, ſaith: εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, *if ye will admit* or *receive it* (that is, aſſent to what I ſay) *this is* Elias, *which was to come*: See *Mark* x. 15. *Luk.* viii. 13. and xviii. 17. *Acts* xi. 1 and xvii. 11. *Jam.* i. 21. The

ſenſe

Chapter III. ſenſe according to this interpretation is very proper: "He that is not "raiſed above an animal Life, and ſo thinks of nothing but this "World, does not aſſent to thoſe things which come from the Spi- "rit of God, for he looks upon them as Trifles.

Ibid. Οὐ δύναται γνῶναι.] The ſimple Verb γνῶναι here ſeems to be put for διαγνῶναι *to diſcern* them, *viz.* from ſuch as are falſe. So it is uſed in *John* x. 14. *I know* γινώσκω *my Sheep, and am known* γινώσκομαι *by them.* That is, as *I* diſcern thoſe who are ſo diſpoſed as to believe in me from all *others*, ſo *they* in like manner diſcern *me* from *Impoſtors.* And I interpret this word γνῶναι here to *diſcern*, becauſe of what follows, where on the contrary ſpiritual Men are ſaid ἀνακρίνειν to *diſcern*, for it is a clear oppoſition: "For ſuch a Man does not *diſtinguiſh* or *diſcern* "thoſe things which are from the Spirit of God, from Trifles. When it is ſaid οὐ δύναται, he *cannot* diſcern them, the meaning of that is ἐφ' ὅσον ψυχικὸς μένει, καὶ ψυχικῶς κείται, *as long as he continues ſenſual, and judges ſenſually*, viz. becauſe being biaſſed by his ſenſual diſpoſition, he minds only preſent and ſenſible things.

Ibid. Ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται.] That is, becauſe the Doctrin of the Goſpel is grounded not upon carnal reaſonings, which reſpect only preſent things, but upon ſpiritual, which take in the knowledg of things Future and Inviſible, and ſuppoſe it to be already in the Mind: or in fewer words; by ſuch a diſpoſition of Mind as whereby wiſe Men are not leſs affected with incorporeal and future Things, than thoſe which are preſent and ſenſible. It is true what our Author here ſays in his Paraphraſe, but beſide the ſcope of this place: The oppoſition here made between *Spiritual* and *Animal* things, plainly proves what I have ſaid. So in *John* vi. 63. by the *Spirit* is meant ſuch things or *Doctrines* as could not be underſtood by the uſe or knowledg of things ſenſible. See afterwards *Chap.* iii. 1, 11. and x. 3, 4.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 15. *Note* b. IT is truly obſerved by learned Men, that this is a proverbial form of Speech, taken from thoſe who haſtily and narrowly make their eſcape from a Fire which had like to conſume them. Such another Metaphor there is in *Livy*, Lib. 22. cap. 35. *L. Æmilium Paulum, qui —— ex damnatione collegæ, & ſua, prope ambuſtus evaſerat —— ad petitionem compellit.* And *cap.* 40. the ſame *Æmilius* ſaith, *ſe populare incendium, priore conſulatu, ſemiuſtum effugiſſe*; That *in his former Conſulſhip, he had eſcaped out of a common Fire, half burned.*

But

But our learned Author forcedly applies all this to his *Gnosticks*: for tho in *Judæa* it is possible the *Gnosticks* might feign themselves to be *Jews*, to escape persecution from them, because the *Jews* there were far more numerous than the *Heathens*; it does not follow there was any reason to be afraid of them at *Corinth*, or in *Achaia*, where the *Jews* were much *fewer* in number than the *Greeks*, and where their Complaints of the Christians were not hearkened to by the Roman Magistrates, as appears from *Acts* xviii. 12, &c. And after the *Jews* once began for their Seditions to be suspected by the *Romans*, as not long after it happened, it had not been carnal Policy for any to join themselves to their party: So that there is no room here for what the *Doctor* says about the compliance of the *Gnosticks* with the *Jews*. Chapter III.

If the *Gnosticks* had reason to fear any danger in *Greece*, it was from the *Romans*; but it does not appear there was any persecution raised against the Christians in those parts, till a great while after the destruction of *Jerusalem*: See Mr. *Dodwell's* Dissert. *de paucitate Martyrum*, among his *Cyprianicæ*. So that that *day* of which St. *Paul* speaks, cannot be referred to the destruction of the *Jews*. It is much better by *Grotius* understood of a long space of time, which very often discovers what is true, and what is false, as many of the Antients have observed. Consult *Stobæi Excerpta de Rerum Natura*, Tit. 11. where there are a great many sayings to that purpose. As for the *Fire* which St. *Paul* here makes mention of, that is nothing but an examination of Doctrins, which after some time the Christians would set themselves to, and upon which all that were false would be rejected, and the true retained; which is called *Fire* by a Metaphor taken from Metals. They that retained the foundation of Christianity, tho they built strange Doctrins upon it, would at length upon that examination of them, find that they had built *stubble* upon *Gold*; and when they understood that they had been in danger of casting away the foundation of Religion it self for those Errors, they would presently forsake them, and escape as out of the Fire, not without the loss of their Reputation and Time, besides what they must be reckoned to have lost in pious Actions and right Apprehensions, by continuing so long in their Errors.

That Character of the *Gnosticks*, which our Author would have to be contained in the following words, agrees to any others that err through a false notion of Wisdom, and do mischief to the Christian Church. So that what he thought to be manifest, seems to me to be plainly false.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 6. Note a. Φρονεῖν properly is *to think*, and does not ſignify *to be proud ſimply* taken, but only when there is ſomething elſe *added* to it, as here ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται: that is, be not lifted up in your Minds, beyond what theſe Inſtructions will allow which I have already written, either in this *Chapter*, or the foregoing, but eſpecially in *Chap.* iii. where St. *Paul* had taught the *Corinthians* what they ought to think both of themſelves, and of their Teachers.

Verſ. 13. *Note* b. I. It is true indeed what our Author ſays about the ſignification of the words περίψημα and περικάθαρμα. But there is another notion given by the ſame Grammarians of theſe words which I like better, as ſeeming to be more agreeable to this place, for *purgamenta, filth, quiſquiliæ, retrimenta*, the *dregs* or *refuſe of any thing*. For the Apoſtles meaning is no more than that he was the Object of every bodies Contempt, and ſo was περίψημα πάντων, or περικάθαρμα τῦ κόσμε, *look'd upon by all the World as refuſe*. And this notion of the words is agreeable to their Original, περικάθαρμα coming from καθαίρειν *to purge*, and περίψημα from περιψᾶν *to wipe off*. *Heſychius* has indeed περικάθαρμα, but without any interpretation of it, which muſt be ſupplied out of *Phavorinus*, who ſeems to have had the moſt correct Copy of that Grammarian, and tells us, that περικαθάρματα is ἀντὶ τῦ ἀπορρήματα, ἢ ἄσπερ ὑποπτώματα, *for filth, and as refuſe*. The other word is interpreted in *Heſychius* by περικατάμαγμα which comes from περικαταμάσσειν *to wipe off*, and ought not to be alter'd. It follows; ἀντίλυτρα, ἀντίψυχα, ἢ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη πάντων, it ſhould be, περιψήματα, ἀντίλυτρα, ἀντίψυχα, ἢ τὰ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη πάντων: but the former word was omitted becauſe of its likeneſs to περικατάμαγμα, which went before. In *Suidas* alſo it ſhould be read περικατάμαγμα, as *Æmil. Portus* obſerved, who ought to have corrected the whole paſſage by *Heſychius*: For it follows in *Suidas*; ἢ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη ἀπολύτρωσις, which he ridiculouſly renders; *ipſa ſub veſtigiis redemptio*, when it is manifeſt the words ought to be read with a *Comma* after ἴχνη thus: ἢ τὸ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη, ἀπολύτρωσις, *or what is under foot*, alſo *redemption*. *Phavorinus* interprets περίψημα not only βδέλυγμα *abomination*, but alſo τὸ σύδαριον ὃ τοὺς ἱδρῶτας τῦ κάμνοντος ἀποψύχει: *a Towel which wipes the Sweat off one that is tired with work*: ἢ τὸ ἀπορριπτούμενον σκύβαλον, ὡς ἄχρηστον: *or refuſe which is caſt away, as uſeleſs*: ὑπὸ μεταφορᾶς δὲ τῶν τραπέζας ἀποψώντων μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν: *by a Metaphor taken from thoſe who wipe down Tables after eating*. He adds, περιψᾶν ἀντὶ τῦ καταμάσσειν, ἀποσπογγίζειν: Περιψᾶν *is put for* that which ſignifies *to purge, to wipe off with a ſponge*; but he ought to

to have ſaid περικάθαρμα, for it is a Compound of the Verb κάω, *to wipe, to ſhave.* Whence in an old *Onomaſticon* περίκαμα is rendred *ſcobs, ſhavings* or *filings.* The old Gloſſes publiſhed together, render περικάθαρμα *purgamentum.* And *Euſtathius* in the place alledged *Edit. Rom.* p. 1935. interprets both the words by ἀπόνιμμα & σπόγγισμα, *that which is waſhed and wiped with a Sponge.* And *Apoſtolius* in *Cent.* 16. 3. interprets them alſo τὸ καταπάτημα πάντων ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη, ἢ ἔμπαγμα, *that which every one treads under foot or deſpiſes.* Chapter V.

II. I do not think that thoſe Nations who had purifications, in ſome reſpect like the Jewiſh, *imitated* therein the *Jews*, to whom moſt of them were perfect Strangers, and ſome of them more powerful and antient than they, as the *Egyptians.* Nor have ſuch Rites conſidered in themſelves any thing *Divine* in them, that they ſhould be referred to *God* as their firſt *inſtitutor.* It is much more probable that the *Jews* had been already accuſtomed to them, whilſt they were among other Nations; and that God in thoſe πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα κόσμου *beggarly elements of the World*, as St. *Paul* calls them, did accommodate himſelf to their Capacity and Temper. Of which matter I have had occaſion to ſpeak in many places of my *Commentary* on the *Pentateuch.*

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THE word ὅλως can ſignify but two things in this place. *Firſt*, it may denote the certainty of the Report, and be referred to the Verb ἀκούεται, and ſo St. *Paul*'s meaning will be, that that report had been a long while ſpread, and it was univerſally affirmed for a certain truth, by all that knew the Church of *Corinth*; in which ſenſe ὅλως is an *Adverb* of *affirming. Secondly*, it may be a Particle, whereby the Apoſtle ſignifies he would tell them *briefly* and *in one word*, why he ſhould come to them ἐν ῥάβδῳ with a *Rod.* In both theſe ſenſes this *Particle* is uſed in good Authors, but never in Dr. *Hammond*'s, that I know of; and if it were, yet in this Conſtruction, that could not be the ſenſe of it. It ſignifies alſo πανταχῶς, *wholly* or *altogether*; but for that ſignification of it there can be no room neither here: See *Mat.* v. 34. and afterwards *Chap.* xv. 29. of this *Epiſtle.* I rather think it is here an *Adverb* of *affirming*, becauſe the Verb ἀκούεται immediately follows it.

Verſ. 2. *Note* c. *Lin.* 13. After the reference to *Rom.* xii. *Note* c.] This paſſage of St. *Clement*, as alſo the Citation out of *Origen*, was taken by our Author out of *Grotius*, as is evident by this, that *Grotius* refers us only to *Conſtit.* 2. without ſetting down the *Chapter*, which

Chapter V. he ought to have done in the quotation of a Book that had been long since divided into Chapters: and so does the *Doctor*. *Grotius* does not truly cite the words of the *Constitutions*; no more does Dr. *Hammond*. The place is in *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 41. and the last word of it here alledged, is not ἀναίμακτη, but ἀκοινώνητη *cut off*. By this it appears that learned Men are not to be absolutely trusted in citing the Testimonies of the Antients.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] If our learned Author to this passage in St. *Paul*, had added only that in 2 *Cor.* xii. 21. no one would ever have disputed with him about these interpretations. But all that he says afterwards is manifestly forced, because St. *Paul* does not speak of that Sorrow which was caused by the censures of the Church, or *Excommunication*, but concerning Sorrow which proceeded from a depravation of Manners in the *Corinthians*, for which St. *Paul* had justly reprehended them. For it is apparent that St. *Paul* speaks to the *whole Corinthian* Church, which no one would say was excommunicated because the Apostle had in this Epistle reproved their Manners, or because he had ordered that *one* incestuous Person, spoken of in this Chapter, *to be delivered to Satan*. The thing confutes it self upon the very mention of it; and I dare say our Author had never written in this manner, if he had not some time before composed a disputation about the *Power of the Keys*, which he was very much in love with, and perhaps more than he should have been, and that made him think he saw those *Keys* where no body else would ever have thought of them.

Vers. 5. *Note* e. I. It had been better in my judgment, if our learned Author had insisted only on the *second* reason he assigns of this phrase, which is manifestly grounded on the Apostle's writings; for what need was there of inventing another *new* one, when the Apostles had given *one* very *sufficient* reason of it? But, unless I am mistaken, the *Doctor* did not sufficiently distinguish the common *Excommunication*, as it is described by the *Jews*, or as it obtained in *after* Ages, from that *delivering up to Satan* in the time of the *Apostles*. For *this* was a consectary of that miraculous Power of the Apostles, whereas the power of *Excommunication* was not conjoined with any Miracle. What *Josephus* relates concerning the *Esseni*, may so be understood, as that the Excommunicate Person should be said to have died for *Grief*, not by the miraculous Virtue of the *Excommunication*; which yet if *Josephus* had believed, it would be no Crime to refuse to give Credit to him. And it is certain those *Esseni* were neither *Prophets* themselves, nor instituted by Prophets: But of this and other things which belong to Excommuni-

Excommunication, we may consult Mr. *J. Selden*, de *Synedr. Judæorum*, Lib. 1. cap. 7, &c. Chapter V.

II. What our Author conjectures about the sense of the Verb ἐξαίρειν, that it signifies here *to deliver up upon Demand* or *Petition*, is certainly ingenious; but if it should be denied, I don't see how it could be proved. For an Executioner does not use to require the Magistrate to deliver up Malefactors to him, but they are delivered up to him without his *demanding* them. And when it is said that Satan desired permission of God *to sift the Apostles*, that was not properly to execute Punishment on them for their Sins, but to assault them the more vehemently with his Temptations and wicked Suggestions: Nor indeed can the Devil be supposed to demand bad Men of God in order to torment them, whom he would rather make happy, if he could, that he might entice others into sin by the example of their Prosperity; so that he is rather to be thought to punish bad men against his will, than to ask leave of God to afflict them. And it's visible that bad men who serve Satan, are so far from being more miserable and obnoxious to diseases than the good, that the contrary is generally true. Whence also by the way we may infer, that if *to be delivered to Satan*, were all one as to be cast out of the Church, those who never were within the Church must have been reckoned from their very birth to have been *delivered up to Satan*, and by consequence have been all more obnoxious to diseases than the Christians: And all likewise that were rightfully Excommunicated should have been said to have been *delivered to Satan*, and been afflicted with Diseases, which yet that it was of old so, no Writer has ever asserted, nor does any one believe. But *delivering up to Satan*, tho conjoined with Excommunication, is not the same thing: And therefore our Author ought not to have confounded this unusual Punishment inflicted by Apostolical Authority, with the ordinary Censures of the Church. Nor is he more fortunate in conjecturing that this *delivering to Satan* was an imitation of God's dealing with Sinners, when he leaves them to the power of the Devil to execute his pleasure upon them.

Vers. 9. Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.] Many Interpreters would have this to be understood of this very Epistle, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, lest it should be thought that any of St. *Paul*'s Epistles were lost; which yet why they might not, no reason at all can be given: For if so be, we want none of those things which are necessary to Salvation, what reason can we have to accuse the Providence of God, if any of the Writings of the Apostles were lost? Should we have been ever the less Disciples of Christ, if any of those Epistles

 had

Chapter V. had been lost, which we now have? Was it absolutely necessary that every thing which the Apostles wrote should be transmitted to Posterity? Nay we may suppose that there were some such Epistles, which it was the interest of the Churches, and Men of that Age to conceal; for there are secrets which every body need not so be acquainted with. And it would be no hard matter to produce instances of such secrets, if every one could not easily find such himself. So that there being no sufficient reason to perswade us that all the Apostles writings either were or ought to have been preserved, if it be most agreeable to the rules of Grammar to suppose, that the Discourse here is about an Epistle which is lost, I do not see why we should not be of that Opinion. And there are three things that shew St. *Paul* to speak of some *other* Epistle.

First, That he had no where in the foregoing part of this admonished the *Corinthians* μὴ συναμίγνυσθαι, *not to associate with Fornicators*: For what he had said about the *Corinthian* who was guilty of *Incest*, cannot be the thing here referred to, because that had no ambiguity in it; and it appears by the following Verse, that the ambiguity of St. *Paul*'s words either did, or at least might have given the *Corinthians* an occasion to mistake: *I wrote unto you*, saith he, *in an Epistle not to keep company with Fornicators*; *but not altogether with the Fornicators of this World, or with the Covetous, or Extortioners, or Idolaters, for then must ye needs have gone out of the World. But now I have written unto you, not to keep Company with any Man that is called a Brother, and is a Fornicator*, &c.

Secondly, The 11th *Verse* which begins with the Particle NYNI *now*, sufficiently shews that the Apostle in that speaks of *this* Epistle, and in the 9th *Verse* of *another*: I WROTE *unto you*, saith he, *in an Epistle, not to*, &c. But NOW *I have written unto you*, &c. There is here a plain opposition between the time of the Apostles writing the one and the other; for tho the Particle *now* be sometimes only a *transition*, and does not signify any difference of time, yet it is manifest that St. *Paul* speaks here of a thing that was past, which he now explains more clearly. Nay tho we should grant the Particle *now* to be here a form of *transition*, and the Apostle to speak of the same Epistle in *both* Verses; yet that Epistle must be an Epistle in which St. *Paul* had spoken *ambiguously*, and not this in which there is *no ambiguity*, as I have just now said.

Thirdly, If the Apostle had meant *this* Epistle, he would not have said ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, but either have *wholly* omitted it, or said ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *in this Epistle*; tho even that could not be handsomly enough said, if but just before he had written that which by many he is supposed

posed here to refer to. But undoubtedly he meant *another* Epistle, as in his 2d Epist. *Chap.* vii. 8. where he speaks of *this*, which is come to our hands: ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς, saith he, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *I made you sorrowful in a Letter*, viz. formerly written to you. Tho I confess the Phrase τὴν ἐπιστολὴν is used elsewhere by St. *Paul*, to signify τὴν παύτην ἐπιστολὴν, *this Epistle*, viz. in *Colos.* iv. 16. and 1 *Thess.* v. 27. But I do not rely only on this reason, or the bare omission of the *Pronoun* παύτης. Chapter V.

All this did not hinder Dr. *Hammond*, who was an excellent Divine, but an indifferent Grammarian, from declaring himself of another Opinion in his *Note* upon this *Verse*, which, if I am not mistaken, was owing to a Theological prejudice, mentioned in the beginning of this Animadversion.

Ibid. *Note* g. *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 23. After the words, *guilty of those Sins.*] I have already confuted what Dr. *Hammond* here says, who would have done better to follow *Grotius* whom he so often had recourse to. That none of the Antients have made any mention of that Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which I say is lost, does not prove that there was no such Epistle; because there might be reasons, as I before said, for the concealing of it, or perhaps also after it was read, for the tearing and burning it, by the Apostle's own order who had written it.

Vers. 10. *Note* h. l. As πλεονέκτης no where signifies *a Voluptuary*, unless it be in Dr. *Hammond*'s Lexicon, as I have shewn on *Rom.* i. 29. so neither does ἅρπαξ when it is alone, signify a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but the circumstances of the place where that word occurs, must oblige us to take it in that sense; otherwise it always signifies one that is greedy of Mony, and takes away what is anothers, either under a pretence of right, or by abusing his Authority to that purpose. And in this place where the word πόρνος is set in the first place, and signifies a Person addicted to Venery, there is no necessity to take it in any other than its ordinary sense: See especially the following Verse, where ἅρπαξ is last mentioned after the names of four other Vices.

II. The word ἄλωσις in 2 *Pet.* ii. 12. signifies no such thing; for *Animals made* εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν are Animals therefore created that they might be taken and destroyed: See *Grotius* on that place. There was no necessity of recurring to the Version of the *Septuagint*, to shew that ἁρπάζω signifies *rapere* to ravish; for who does not know that?

III. What is said of the sense of *Gen.* vi. 11. is all mere conjecture, which has no ground either in the History, or the proper signification of the words. The Hebrew חמס *hhamas* does not signify *Violence*, but *Injury*; and שחת *schibbeth*, *he was corrupted*, signifies any change

Chapter V. whatsoever for the worse, and not only Lusts, as any Lexicon will shew. It's true, the Marriages of the *Enfidæ* with the *Cainites*, were a means of corrupting all Mankind; but it does not thence follow that Lust was their principal Sin, no more than from St. *Peter's* joining the Men who lived before the Flood with the *Sodomites*; for to put them together, it is sufficient that they were both Sinners, tho their sins were different, and both utterly destroyed, tho not in the same manner.

IV. I grant a lustful Person was the occasion of what the Apostle here says; but it does not follow therefore that the Vices which he mentions in *vers.* 10, and 11. belong to the same thing. Surely εἰδωλολάτρης, λοίδορος, & μέθυσος, do not signify one given to *Venery*, tho I confess, Idolaters, Railers, and Drunkards, have been often addicted to Lust.

V. There is no doubt but ἁρπαξ is sometimes taken for a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but as I said before, the Circumstances of the place must shew that the word is used in that sense, as in the place alledged out of *Harmenopulus*, which nevertheless I do not warrant, because I have not look'd into him. But the Passages cited out of the *Sybillin Oracles*, are certainly wrested; nor do I believe that our learned Author took them out of the Book it self: For the first is in the *first* Book, not the *second*, out of which he cites it. And the place it self shews that he misinterprets it; for after the word ἁρπακτῆρσι is subjoined the word τύραννοι, *Tyrants*, who are rather Ravishers of Goods and Possessions than of Men. In the *second* are collected the names of several Vices, whether they have any Affinity with one another or not: and tho Men are called by the *Sybil*, *A race of Adulterers*, *Idolaters*, *Deceivers*, *and Persons whose breasts are full of Rage*; and she adds,

Αὐτοὺς ἁρπάζοντες, ἀναίδεα θυμὸν ἔχοντες,

Snatching to themselves, *having an impudent Mind*; it does not thence follow that ἁρπάζειν must here be understood of the ravishing of a Boy or a Woman, tho there were nothing added which shewed the contrary. But it follows,

Οὐδὲ γὰρ πλουτῶν, ὃς ἔχει κτέανα μεγάλα,

For no rich Man that has great possessions, *will make another participate of them.* By which it is evident that it is not so to be understood. Two Verses after that it follows,

——— χαίρει

——————— Χήρῃ τε γυναῖκες
Στίξουσιν χρυσίου ἄλλης πολλαὶ διὰ κέρδος.

Many Widows will privately love others for Gain. Which is nothing to the Verb ἀρπάζειν. In the laſt Verſe but two of the Book, the *Sybil* ſaith, that the day of Judgment, of which ſhe had before ſpoken, would come

——————— Ὅππότε θεῖον διαλήσεται ὀδμή,

When the ſmell of Brimſtone ſhould be gone. In which I cannot tell whether ſhe had any reſpect to the deſtruction of *Sodom*.

VI. In *Mat.* xxiii. the words ἁρπαγὴ & ἀκρασία are uſed in their ordinary ſignification; and καθαρότης, which is oppoſed to them, is not only that *purity* which conſiſts in Abſtinence from *carnal Pleaſures*, but from any ſort of Wickedneſs, as appears by the place alledged out of St. *Luke*, where πονηρία ſignifies all kinds of Vice, as the Hebrew רעה *rabah* in *Gen.* vi. 5. They who think otherwiſe, can bring no Argument either from the thing it ſelf, or the word to confirm their Opinion: So that upon the whole here is, as the Poet ſpeaks,

Pergula pictorum, veri nihil, omnia falſa.

Ibid. *Note* i. Here is, I confeſs, μέγας ῥόος *a mighty flood* of Examples, but

——————— Πολλαὶ
Λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.

For it is true indeed, the Solemnities uſed in the worſhip of ſome Deities, in ſome places, were accompanied with ſhameful Luſts, as I have ſhewn my ſelf on *Exod.* xxxiv. 15. But that either every where, or for the moſt part it was ſo, I leave them to believe who are ignorant of the antient Heathen Cuſtoms. Our Author ſpeaks as if the *Greeks* and *Romans* did very freely ſuffer their Wives and Children to be corrupted and proſtituted in their ſacred Myſteries; and as if that was the general Cuſtom, than which nothing can be more falſe: Nay there were ſevere Decrees ſometimes made againſt Impurities in the worſhip of their Gods, as appears from *Livy*, Lib. 39. and by an order of the Senate it ſelf ſtill extant: See alſo *Cicero de Legibus*,

Chapter V.

Lib. 2. Cap. 14, 15. I do not therefore believe that an *Idolater* simply is ever taken for a *Fornicator* or *Adulterer*, as if Idolatry and Uncleanneſs had always gone together: Nor does our Author produce any one Paſſage to make it probable; for tho all the Sins which are joined with Idolatry here and elſewhere, reſpected carnal Pleaſures, it would in no wiſe follow that by *Idolatry* is meant *Impurity*, when neither the proper ſignification of that word, nor its uſe will admit that ſenſe; and it is very common for Sins of various kinds to be joined together. And yet upon this only ground almoſt, our learned Author in his *Note* on *Rom.* i. 29. endeavoured to prove that πλεονεξία ſignified *Luxury*, againſt the proper ſignification of the word, and the conſtant uſe of all Writers, as I have there ſhewn. And the ſame I ſhall do here, as to the word *Idolatry*, leſt any ſhould be deceived by his Authority, or multitude of Examples.

I. The Hebrew word גלולי *gilloul* ſignifies *Dung* properly, and Idols are by way of contempt ſo called, not becauſe of thoſe carnal Pollutions that accompanied the Worſhip of them, but becauſe they were made no more account of than *Dung* by the *Jews*: For *Dung* did not pollute, *viz.* with any legal Pollution. By the *Septuagint* this word is rendred βδέλυγμα, not as if that were the proper ſignification of it, but becauſe the *Jews* who ſpake Greek, commonly called Idols βδελύγματα *abominable things*, not *polluted*; for βδελύσσειν does not ſignify *to be polluted*, but *to abhor*, *to deteſt*. And the ſame is the ſignification of the Hebrew root שקץ *ſchakats*, whence שקוץ an *abominable thing*, not properly becauſe of carnal Pollution, but becauſe it is evil. *Lyra*'s Authority is not to be regarded. See my Notes on *Gen.* xxi. 7.

II. I do not doubt but in the *Bacchanalia*, or night Revels of *Bacchus*, there were horrible Villanies committed; but I do not think it was univerſally known in *Greece*, that thoſe things were done there in honour of that God. Our learned Author might have produced a great many fitter Teſtimonies, to ſhew that the Myſteries of *Ceres* were *ſecret*, than thoſe which he alledges out of *Horace* and *Seneca*; or rather have let them quite alone, ſince every Child knows ſuch things.

III. That paſſage in *Jerem.* xliv. 19. is perfectly foreign to this buſineſs, there being nothing there ſaid about nocturnal Sacrifices: For thus the Women who had offered Sacrifice to the Queen of Heaven, that is, the Moon, ſpeak: *When we burned Incenſe to the Queen of Heaven, and poured out drink Offerings, did we make her Images without our Husbands?* &c.

IV. I am of opinion indeed with our Author, that God by the ſacred mark of Circumciſion, did ſignify the amputation of inordinate Pleaſures;

Pleaſures; but whether he had a particular reſpect to the ſhameful practices of the Heathens in their Religious Solemnities, which in that Ceremony he condemned, I cannot tell; nor is it evident from any place of Scripture. Chapter V.

V. Our Author had not look'd into 2 *Kings* xxiii. 7. for the word there in the Hebrew is לאשרת *laaſcherah*, that is, *in a Grove*, not עשתרות *haſtheroth*, which has a different ſignification. But he was deceived by an overhaſty reading of what Mr. *Selden* ſays about this matter, *de Diis Syris*, Synt. ii. *Cap.* 2. who may be conſulted; and who has alſo treated at large of *Milytta* and the reſt here ſpoken of, in *Syntag.* 2. *Cap.* 7. To me likewiſe it ſeems moſt probable, what he conjectures about the original of the names *Atergatis* and *Derceto*, in *cap.* 3. of the ſame *Syntagm.* as if they were the ſame with אדיר דג *addir-dag*, *a magnificent Fiſh*, becauſe he ſets down a ſtory which agrees with his conjecture, as he at large ſhews.

VI. By a pleaſant miſtake our Author produces Verſes out of the 3d Book of the *Sybillin Oracles*, as reſpecting the *Roman Luſtrations*, of which there is not in them the leaſt mark or footſtep; merely, if I am not miſtaken, becauſe *Joan. Opſopæus*, who turned the *Sybillin Oracles* into bad Latin Verſe, had thus tranſlated the two firſt which Dr. *Hammond* alledges:

Maſque mari ſe junget, ſtatuentque pudendis
In LUSTRIS *pueros.*

But theſe *Luſtra* any one will ſee to be *Bawdy-Houſes*, who obſerves it to be in the Greek διχεδ πόρνε. The other places prove nothing, but only that the Heathens were generally given to inordinate Luſts, but not that thoſe Luſts were reckoned by the moſt of them a part of Religion.

VII. In the *Eleuſinia Sacra*, or Rites performed in honour of *Ceres*, there were indeed ſome indecent things practiſed, as *Joannes Meurſius* in *Eleuſiniis* will inform us; but that any horrible Villanies, and ſuch as are not to be named, were committed in them, will not be thought by any that ſhall read what is ſaid of them by *Cicero* de *Legibus*, Lib. 2. in the place before cited.

VIII. In *Coloſſ.* iii. 5. the word πλεονεξία is taken in its uſual and conſtant ſignification for *Covetouſneſs*, and not for luſtful Idolatry: The ſame I ſay of *Epheſ.* v. 5. The reſt of the places alledged prove nothing at all, for the Affinity there is between ſome Vices does not make it neceſſary that all others ſhould be of the ſame kind. What is pro-

Chapter V. duced out of *Polycarpus* and *Beza*, has been already confuted on *Rom.* i. 29. The words of the *Council* of *Illiberis* are figurative, and signify no more than that the Heathen Priests, who after they had taken upon them the profession of Christianity, did again return to the worship of Idols, were as guilty as if they had committed the three Sins there mentioned.

Vers. 11. Our Author did well to add this at last, for it is false that λοίδορος ever signifies a lustful Person: See *Hesychius*, *Phavorinus*, the *Old Glosses*, and all the *Lexicons* in the World. I name *Hesychius* among the rest, because he interprets ὑβρισὴς by a *Railer*, for there is one sort of ὕβρις which lies only in *words*: Whence the *Old Glosses* render it not only *injuriam Injury*, but also *convitium*, *probrum*, railing, reviling, & ὑβρίζει *convitiatur*, *convitium facit*, *contumeliatur*, ὑβρισὴς *contumeliosus*. *Phavorinus*; Ὕβρις ἡ μόνον ἐν λόγοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἤ τι ἄλλο πᾶν ἔργον αἰσχρὸν· ὑβρισταὶ γὰρ καὶ κακολογοῦντες· ὑβρισταὶ δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ αἰσχρεργοῦντες. As for the *Gnosticks*, I should no more imagin them to be here referred to, than any other bad Men, unless our Author meant to give the honourable name of *Gnosticks* to all the vile wretches that in the Apostles times had crept into the Christian Assemblies; tho why he should, I can see no reason.

Vers. 12. *Note* 1. Our Author who makes his stile both in English and Latin rugged with unnecessary and misplaced Parentheses, and thereby often renders it tedious to the Reader, makes too much use of that expedient to connect the Discourse of the Sacred Writers. Besides, if we read the Greek words, it will appear that the Discourse does not sufficiently hang together; for we should be obliged to read: τοῦτο ποιοῦντες ἐξαρεῖτε, *doing this ye shall put away*.

I shall propose here a Conjecture, which if it were true, would make all things plain. We read the words in our Copies thus: τί γάρ μοι ΚΑΙ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; Now what construction this is, τί μοι κρίνειν, I confess I do not understand. I know the sense commonly put upon it is, *What have I to do*, or *what business is it of mine* to judg them that are without? *i. e.* it is not my business. But there is no example given of any such Phrase. Besides, the *Conjunction* ΚΑΙ intervening, makes the Phrase still more harsh; for which reason it is left out in the *Alexandrian* and other *Manuscripts*, and omitted by the *Syriack* Interpreter; but in my judgment rashly, because that Particle may be of use to direct us to the true reading, which seems to be this: Τί γάρ μοι, ΤΟΥΣ ἔξω; ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΟΥΝ ΓΕ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε· τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὁ Θεὸς κρίνει· καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε τὸ πονηρὸν, &c. *For what have I to do with those that are without? But do you judg those that are within; and those that are without*

God

God judgeth: and ye shall put away the wicked Person from among you. Chapter VI.

First, τί μοὶ κ) τοὺς is a Phrase very common in the Sacred Writers, and is as much as, *take care of your own Business, and I'll take care of mine:* See *Mat.* viii. 29. *John* ii. 4. and Interpreters on those places. And the sense here must certainly be; It is not my business to take care of the Manners of the Heathens, who have not yet embraced the Gospel. *Next*, the words ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΟΥΝΓΕ might easily enough be changed into ΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ ΟΥΧΙ, because the Verb κρίνειν occurs twice in the following words. And μενοῦνγε is an *Adversative* Particle frequently used by St. *Paul:* See *Rom.* iv. 20. and x. 18. and *Phil.* iii. 8. This makes the sense very plain, whereas that interrogation, *do not ye judg them?* is very harsh and improper in this place. If St. *Paul* had said; It is not my business to judg those who are *among you*, do not ye judg them? this would be some sense, tho foreign to this place, and the discourse would be current; but as it is now, the connexion of the words is extremely harsh. *Thirdly*, the following words τοὺς ΔΕ ἔξω (there being here a manifest opposition between the οἱ ἔξω & οἱ ἔσω shews there ought to have preceded the Particle ΜΕΝ, which is contained in ἢ μενοῦνγε, for μενοῦν is all one with μὲν οὖν, and if we believe *H. Stephanus*, ought to be so distinctly written. *Fourthly*, Καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε is evidently conjoin'd with κρίνετε, *judg and ye shall put away:* The words intervening, *and those that are without God judgeth*, ought not to be included in a *Parenthesis*, because they are set in opposition to that which went immediately before, and not inserted κατ' παρηνθήκην.

And it cannot seem strange, that I suppose this place to be corrupted, seeing the *Syriack* Interpreter seems to have thought the same, who has left out in the 12*th Verse* κ) & οὐχὶ, & κ) again in the 13*th*, because he did not see how the Apostle's words could otherwise be made to hang together. The *Latin* also and the *Arabian* Interpreters omit the Particle κ) in *both* Verses. The *Ethiopian* departs yet further from the rest, who has; *& eum qui intus homines judicabit.* And there are other variations in the *Manuscript* Copies, which I pass by.

CHAP. VI.

Vers. 2. *Note* a. WHAT our Author says here about the notion of the word κριτήριον is true; but as that word has more significations than one, so in this place it seems rather to be taken for *judgment:* for ἀνάξιοι ἐλαχίστων κριτηρίων signifies not *Persons unworthy to sit in the lowest Judgment-seats*, but *to judg of the smallest matters*; and therefore is very rightly rendred by the *Vulgar*

qui

Chapter VI. *qui de minimis judicetis.* And thus the *Old Gloſſes* render κριτήριον *judicium, examen, ſenſus, Judgment, Examination, Opinion,* and κριτήρια *judicia.* But in *verſ.* 4. Κριτήρια βιωτικὰ ἔχειν ſeems to ſignify *to have things to be judged of relating to life,* as Dr. *Hammond* himſelf interprets it in his Paraphraſe. So that in this Verſe κριτήριον is taken for the *act of judging,* and in *Verſ.* 4. for *things to be judged* of.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. Here the word ὅλως is as much as *omnino,* or a Particle of affirming, as I have ſhewn on that place in *Chap.* v. 1.

Verſ. 10. Πλεονέκτης.] This word our Author here in the Margin, according to his manner, interprets of *a Perſon of inordinate Luſts.* But if that were the true ſenſe of it, it ſhould have been joined with the foregoing words in the 9*th Verſe,* and not have been put here in the 10*th* after the word κλέπται: But πλεονέκτης ſignifies in this place, as it is rendred in the *Old Gloſſes, fraudator, avidus, A cheating, covetous Perſon.*

Verſ. 11. Ἐδικαιώθητε.] Δικαιωθῆναι in this place is the ſame with ἀπολούσασθαι & ἁγιασθῆναι, *to be waſhed and ſanctified,* which went juſt before. The Phraſe ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ſignifies, when ye became Chriſtians, or took upon you the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion in Baptiſm; which obliged all thoſe that received it, to reformation of Life. See *Acts* ii. 38.

Verſ. 19. Ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος.] This expreſſion may be illuſtrated by a paſſage in the Epiſtle of *Barnabas,* where he ſaith: Ναὸς δὲ ἅγιος τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ καταπαπήριον ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία: *For the habitation of our Heart is a holy Temple to the Lord.* The Holy Spirit is ſaid to dwell in our Bodies, becauſe it is preſent with our Minds, which inhabit our Bodies. *Grotius* does but trifle when he tells us, that *the Spirit of the Mind is the Sanctuary, the other parts of the Mind the Court of the Temple, and the Body the Porch and its outward parts.* Such a Remark as this might perhaps be tolerable in a Pulpit, but by no means in an exact Interpreter. *Claudian* has an expreſſion much like this in his *Second Book,* on the firſt Conſulſhip of *Stilichon,* ſpeaking of the Goddeſs *Mercy:*

Hæc Dea, pro templis & thure calentibus aris,
Te fruitur, poſuitque ſuas hoc pectore ſedes.

And a little after:

Huic Divæ germana Fides, eademque ſorori
Corde tuo DELUBRA *tenens.*

Verſ.

Verſ. 20. Ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς.] St. *Paul* ſeems to allude here to a Houſe, which none but he may uſe how he pleaſes that has purchaſed it. And God having, as it were, bought our Bodies as well as our Souls, he only has a ſoveraign Right to preſcribe to us how we ſhall uſe them. Chapter VII.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. OF this matter, according to the Doctrine of the *Rabbins*, Mr. *Selden* has treated at large in his *Uxor Hebraica*, Lib. 3. c. 4. and ſeqq.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. Ἀκρασία and its oppoſite ἐγκράτεια, according to the ſubject matter, are taken ſometimes in a larger, and ſometimes in a more contracted Notion. In general ἀκρατὴς ſignifies *one that has not the command of his Paſſions*, ὅστις οὐ κρατεῖ τῶν πάθων, ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν κρατεῖται, *but is commanded or overruled by them:* And on the contrary, ἐγκρατὴς one that is not ſubject to the dominion of any Paſſion, but is always his own maſter: But becauſe the Paſſions are various, proportionable to the variety of objects to which they may be carried out, therefore ἀκρασία & ἐγκράτεια have alſo divers objects, as *Ariſtotle* will teach us in the beginning of his 7th Book of *Ethicks*, *ad Nicomachum*. And ſo in this place, where the diſcourſe is about the lawful pleaſures of Marriage, ἀκράτεια is uſed in a much narrower ſignification, not for a *Vice*, i. e. a diſpoſition of Mind contrary to the Law of God, and pernicious to humane Society, but a certain natural heat of Body, which of it ſelf is neither a Vice nor a Vertue. But it is deſcribed as a Vice, becauſe it is an occaſion of becoming vitious to thoſe who do not govern it with reaſon.

Verſ. 6. *Note* c. *Col.* 1. *Lin.* 45. After the words, *on the other ſide.*] Our learned Author might have confirmed this obſervation about the uſe of the word θέλω for *malo*, *I had rather*, by that Paſſage in *Hoſ.* vi. 6. *I will* (חפצתי) *have Mercy and not* (ולא) *Sacrifice*; which is all one as if God had ſaid, מובח *mizzebahh*, *than Sacrifice:* and if the Prophet had written ſo, it could not have been rendred otherwiſe than by *I will*, or *had rather*. And that this the Prophet meant is evident by the next words; *and the knowledg of God*, מעולות *meholoth*, *than burnt Offerings:* whence the *Septuagint* according to the *Vatican* Copy, read; ἔδωκ ἂν θέλω ἢ θυσίαν, καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ ἢ ὁλοκαυτώματα; and *Jonathan*, ממרח *than Sacrifice:* But in *Mat.* ix. 13. and in the *Alexandrian* Copy we read κὶ ὐ θυσίαν, which is yet to the ſame ſenſe. It is certain the Hebrews have no Verb whereby to expreſs the Latin *malo* or μᾶλλον θέλω in Greek.

Chapter VII.

Verſ. 14. *Note* d. From this place I readily allow the deduction of this Conſectary, that the Infants of Chriſtian Parents may be baptized, becauſe they are *Holy*, i. e. reckoned as a part of God's People; but that this Phraſe ſignifies Baptiſm it ſelf, does not appear by any thing that Dr. *Hammond* here ſays: For tho the Verb קדש to *ſanctify*, ſignify alſo *to waſh*, it does not follow that by ἅγιον קדוש may be meant one whoſe condition is ſuch as to make him capable of being *waſhed*, or *baptized*. And on the contrary, the Children of Heathens were accounted ἀκάθαρτα *impure*, that is, as part of thoſe who were out of God's Covenant; and ſo could not be baptized, becauſe Baptiſm follows the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, which could neither be made by Parents who were Heathens, nor by Infants. This is the Notion of the words *Holy* and *Impure*, which being firſt uſed in that ſenſe by the *Jews*, came afterwards to be taken in the ſame by the Chriſtians; which is the reaſon why Chriſtians are ſo often ſtiled *Saints* in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles. See the inſcriptions of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles.

Verſ. 17. *Note* e. I. The ſame reaſon which moved Dr. *Hammond* to prefer the reading of ſome antient Copies mentioned by *Theophylact*, before that in ours, makes me think that the ordinary reading ought to be retained: Namely, becauſe the obſcurity ariſing in the ſenſe from εἰ μὴ might eaſily induce ſome Scribe or Critick to change εἰ into ἢ, and join theſe words with the foregoing, to make the ſenſe more perſpicuous; but there was no reaſon why, when the ſenſe was clear, it ſhould be made more obſcure.

II. I have more than once obſerved, that the end of an Annotation does not agree with the beginning; the reaſon of which I ſuppoſe to be, that the *Doctor* did not write it all at the ſame time: For otherwiſe he would have made his Diſcourſe here hang better together. For after he had ſaid, *it will be reaſonable to acquieſce therein*, viz. in that *other reading*, he gives a reaſon for ſo doing, which makes it unreaſonable; for if the ſenſe will be current, tho we retain the ordinary reading, and only change the pointing of the words, what reaſon can there be to acquieſce in any alteration of them?

III. We ought therefore to keep to the preſent reading of all Copies and Interpreters, and τὸ εἰ μὴ muſt be rendred *but*, as the *Syriack* and *Arabick* render it אלא, that is, ἀλλά.

Verſ. 34. *Note* h. The *Oxford Edit.* of the *New Teſtament*, *Anno* 1675. takes notice of ſome Copies which read this place in the ſame manner as the *Alexandrian*, here mentioned by our Author, excepting that the ſecond ἀγαμῶ is omitted; but there is no mention there made of the *Alexandrian* Copy, the difference between which and others

others in the reading of this place, is nevertheleſs ſet down in the *London Polyglott:* But in that Edition there are other inſtances of very great negligence. I am perfectly of Dr. *Hammond*'s opinion, as to the uſe of the Verb μεϊζω, which I ſhall confirm by theſe Verſes of *Virgil*, wherein he elegantly deſcribes the Mind diſtracted with variety of Cares, and uſes the word *dividere*, Æneid. 8. at the beginning. Chapter VIII.

——*Magno curarum fluctuat æſtu,*
Atque animum nunc huc celerem, nunc DIVIDIT *illuc,*
In parteſque rapit varias, perque omnia verſat.

Nay and the Verb μεριμνειζω, which ſignifies *to be vexed with Care*, is defined by the *Greek Grammarians* to be ΜΕΡΙΖΕΣΘΑΙ οἱ διαφόρως βουλὰς, ἢ παρὰ τὸ μεϊζω λέγεται τροπῇ τοῦ Ε εἰς Η. *to be divided between different Reſolutions, becauſe it comes from* μεϊζειν *by changing the Letter* Ε *into* Η. See *Euſtathius* on *Homer*, pag. 80. and 1427. *Edit. Rom.*

But there are two things in this Annotation of the *Doctor* liable to cenſure. The firſt is his Citation out of the *Jeruſalem Paraphraſe*, which makes nothing to the purpoſe, it being manifeſt that thoſe words ſignify *Diſtruſt* or *Unbelief*, not *Cares* or *Diſtractions*. And the *ſecond* is his ſaying that *a Verb in the Singular number cannot be applied to two Nouns:* whereas nothing is more common in all the beſt Authors in both Languages than that Conſtruction, and, which I wonder he did not take notice of, it muſt be admitted according to the reading of the *Alexandrian* Copy, which he prefers before the other: ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος, καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, &c.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. I Don't think St. *Paul* had a reſpect to the Hebrew word, which perhaps was unknown to the *Corinthians*, but to the meaning of the word εἴδωλον it ſelf which he here uſes, and which properly ſignifies an Image conceived in the Mind, which is no where but in our Underſtanding; and afterwards was applied to other things which are look'd upon as vain Spectres. And this is the reaſon why the *Jews* who ſpake Greek, gave the name of *Idols*, firſt to the Gods of the Heathens *themſelves*, and then to their *Statues*. All which I ſhall deduce a little more particularly, becauſe it will conduce very much to the clear underſtanding of this Paſſage. And firſt of all it muſt be obſerved that the Verb εἰδωλεύω ſignifies *to be*

Chapter VIII. *like unto*, in which ſenſe it is often uſed in *Homer*, as for inſtance in *Iliad* B. *Verſ.* 280.

——— Παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
Εἰδομένη κήρυκι.

And near to him ſtood greyeyed Minerva, like to *a Cryer*; ὁμοιωθεῖσα, ſaith the *Scholiaſt*. Whence the words εἶδος & εἰδέα came to ſignify an *Image* or repreſentation of things, ſuch as is formed in the Mind. And εἴδωλον, as *H. Stephanus* has ſhewn out of *Plutarch*, ſignifies ſometimes the ſame. And therefore *Plato* in his *Phædrus*, p. 346. *Ed. Gen. Ficin.* calls an incorporeal thing, ſuppoſing it appeared in a viſible ſhape, εἴδωλον, in that remarkable Sentence: Δεινὰς γὰρ ἂν παρεῖχεν ἔρωτας ἡ φρόνησις, εἴ τι τοῦτο ἑαυτῆς ἐναργὲς ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ παρέχοιτο τοῖς ὄμμασιν ἰόν: *Men would be extreamly in love with Wiſdom, if it did but preſent ſome lively Image of it ſelf to their view.* And becauſe they thought that the Souls of dead Perſons were clothed with a certain airy Form, reſembling outwardly that Body which they inhabited when thoſe Perſons were alive, that Form they uſually called εἴδωλον. We frequently meet in *Homer* with this half Verſe, νεκύων εἴδωλα καμόντων *the Images of deceaſed Men*. *Virgil* renders it *ſimulachra* & *figuras*, which he thus deſcribes in *Æneid.* 6. *Verſ.* 292. ſpeaking of *Æneas*, who was going to encounter the Ghoſts, if *Sybilla* had not diverted him:

Et ni docta comes tenues ſine corpore vitas
Admoneat volitare, cava ſub imagine formæ,
Irruat & fruſtra ferro diverberet umbras.

This was the uſe of the word εἴδωλον among the *Greeks*, when the *Jews* firſt came acquainted with them; and therefore when they had learned to ſpeak Greek, they fitly called the Gods of the Nations εἴδωλα, partly becauſe they were but meer human Inventions, having no real Exiſtence; and partly becauſe they generally worſhipped dead men, νεκύων εἴδωλα καμόντων, or to uſe the words of *Virgil*,

Horum umbras tenues, ſimulachraque luce carentum.

Which ſhews likewiſe the reaſon why the Apoſtle ſays that *an Idol is nothing in the World*, for the Fictions of Men have no real Exiſtence, nor are there any ſuch Images or Apparitions of dead Perſons, as the Poets ſpeak of, no more than there is any

Horrendum

Horrendum ſtridens, flammiſque armata Chimæra.

Philo Judæus, Lib. *de Monarchia* affirms, that *Riches* alſo are called in Scripture εἴδωλα, becauſe they are but the fading Images of true good: ταῦτ' ἐστὶν, ſaith he, ἃ ζῶσιν εἴδωλα, σκιαῖς ἐοικότα καὶ φασμάτων, οὐδενὸς ἑστηκότα ἐχυρῶ καὶ βεβαίῳ: *theſe are the things which* [the Scripture] *calleth Idols, like Shadows and Phantoms, which depend upon nothing firm or certain.*

Verſ. 5. Καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ, &c.] The ſenſe of this Verſe is not truly expreſſed by our Author out of *Theophylact*. It muſt be rendred; *for tho* there be they which are called Gods, whether *in Heaven or in Earth* (*as* really *there* are *Gods many, and Lords many*) *yet to us there is one God the Father*, &c. By *Gods in Heaven* are meant God and the Angels; *in the Earth* Magiſtrates, who are alſo called *the Lords of the World*. But Chriſtians called only the *Father*, by whom all things were created, *God*; and Jeſus Chriſt, by whom were all things, *Lord* in the moſt excellent ſenſe. The Apoſtle has no reference to the falſe Gods or *Idols* of the Heathens, nor to the common way of ſpeaking among the *Jews* themſelves; for he grants that thoſe were truly called Gods and Lords. He ſeems when he wrote this, to have had in his mind that paſſage of *Moſes* in *Deut.* x. 17. *The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, mighty and terrible*, whom the *Jews* ought alone to ſerve. And in like manner St. *Paul* here teaches, that tho there were many that were called Gods and Lords, yet there was but one of thoſe Gods, and one of thoſe Lords that were to be made the Objects of divine Worſhip.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. No body will deny but ἀσθενῆν, where the Diſcourſe is about the Body, ſignifies to be ſick, and is taken alſo for a diſeaſe of the Mind, if the diſcourſe be about the Mind. But I don't think St. *Paul* here has a reſpect to the general Notion of a diſtemper of the Mind, or of Sin, but rather ſpeaks of an infirm purpoſe in the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion, and the obſervation of its Precepts; ſuch as is uſual in ignorant People, who are hardly brought to an entire renunciation of their former Errors. This is the proper ſignification of the word ἀσθενὴς: And theſe the Apoſtle calls ἀσθενοῦντας τῇ πίστει, *Rom.* xiv. 1, 2. which does not ſignify *ſick* or *diſeaſed in the Faith*, but Perſons whoſe Faith was not ſo firm and ſtrong as it ſhould have been. As on the other hand in *Chap.* iv. 19. of the ſame Epiſtle, ſpeaking of *Abraham*, he ſays that οὐκ ἠσθένησε τῇ πίστει *he was not weak in Faith*, i. e. he did not doubt: And ſo in the *Septuagint*, ἀσθενεῖν is ſometimes taken for *to ſtumble*, becauſe thoſe who do not take their ſteps *firm*, often ſtumble, as Children do when they firſt begin to go alone.

* Our

Chapter IX. Our Author alledges St. *Paul*'s words in the 7th *Verſe*, as if St. *Paul* had ſaid συνηθείᾳ τῷ εἰδώλῳ, and not συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου *with Conſcience of the Idol*; in which he follows the *Alexandrian* and two other *Roman* Copies. But I ſuſpect that to be only the gloſs of ſome Men, that did not underſtand the meaning of the Phraſe συνείδησις εἰδώλου, which ſignifies an Opinion or Perſwaſion concerning the favourable preſence of the Idol at their Holy Feaſts, with which ſome of the *Corinthians* were ſtill at that time poſſeſſed, as Dr. *Hammond* has well obſerved.

Verſ. 10. Οικοδομηθήσεται.] That is, *confirmed*, as I have ſhewn in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 3. Sect. 1. c. 16. 11.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 5. Μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν;] *Have we not power to lead about a Siſter, a Wife?* So it muſt be rendred, for I have already ſhewn on *Rom.* xvi. 1. that the Opinion which Dr. *Hammond* follows here in his Paraphraſe, in concurrence with ſome of the Antients, is very improbable. If St. *Paul* had deſigned to ſay what they affirm, he would not have added γυναῖκα, for ἀδελφὴν alone would have been ſufficient; and the Greeks do no more uſe to ſay ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα for a *Siſter*, than ἀδελφὸν ἀνδρα for a *Brother*. St. *Paul* therefore here intimates that he had married indeed a Wife, whom he might if he pleaſed take along with him as a Companion in his Travels, but he did not περιάγειν *lead her about*, leſt ſhe ſhould be burdenſom to the Churches; for tho he could have eaſily got his own living by working, yet it would have been much more difficult for him to provide both for himſelf and his Wife, if ſhe had travelled with him.

It is groundleſly therefore inferred by ſome from this place, that St. *Paul* was a ſingle man, for he does not ſay, *have not we power to have a Wife*, γυναῖκα ἔχειν, but *to lead about a Wife*, viz. which he already had. And to this place perhaps the *Interpolator* of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, pag. 98. *Ed. Uſſer.* had a reſpect; where having ſpoken of unmarried Perſons, he ſaith: Οὐ φέρω δὲ τοὺς λοιποὺς μακαρίσαι ὑπὲρ γάμους κεκοσμῆσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐμαυτὸν λέγω· ἄξιόν μοι ἐστὶ διὰ παντὸς εὑρεθῆναι, ὡς τῶν ἴχνεσιν αὐτῶν εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, ὡς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακὼβ, ὡς Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ Ἡσαΐας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Προφητῶν, ὡς Πέτρος, καὶ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀποστόλων τῶν γάμοις κεκοσμημένων: *but I do not derogate from the reſt of the Bleſſed that were joined in marriage, which I have now mentioned. For I deſire to be found worthy of God at their footſteps in his Kingdom; as of* Abraham, *and* Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *as of* Joſeph *and* Iſaiah, *and the reſt of the Pro-*

phets,

phets, and as of St. Peter *and St.* Paul, *and the other Apoſtles, who were married Men.* Nor is it any objection againſt this, what St. *Paul* ſays in *Chap.* vii. 7, 8. of this Epiſtle; for the meaning of the Apoſtle in that place is only, that he wiſhed every body elſe had as little Appetite to the lawful pleaſures of Marriage as himſelf, and that it was expedient for Widows and unmarried People at that time to remain as he was, that is, not to be more deſirous of Marriage than he was of the Society of his Wife. Chapter IX.

Verſ. 10. Τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτῦ μετέχειν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.] The ſame word ἐλπὶς has a twofold Notion in this place; for the former ſignifies the *thing* hoped for, and the latter the *Affection* it ſelf. Such things are common in the writings of the Apoſtles. See Note on St. *John*'s Goſp. *c.* i. 16.

Verſ. 12. Ἐξουσίας ὑμῶν.] That is, ἐις ὑμᾶς *over you:* See *Mat.* x. 1. *John* xvii. 2. and what I have obſerved in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 2. S. 1. c. 12. 11. So likewiſe afterwards *Chap.* x. 6. of this Epiſtle, τύποι ἡμῶν are τύποι εἰς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, *examples for our Inſtruction.*

Verſ. 17. *Note* a. Some ſuch *works of Supererogation* may really be done, but have a care of thinking upon that account that they deſerve any reward from God: The reaſon is, becauſe tho Men may out of a pious zeal do that whereof the omiſſion would not bring puniſhment upon them; yet they have offended in other reſpects, and ſtand in need of God's Mercy, by which alone they can obtain the pardon of their Sins. If God had dealt according to ſtrict juſtice with St. *Paul*, he had never pardoned thoſe Sins which he had been guilty of whilſt he remained a *Jew*, nor had his ſucceſsful Zeal in the ſervice of God when a Chriſtian, been ſufficient to expiate the Perſecutions he had formerly ſtirred up againſt the Chriſtians. But as he had mercifully forgiven him all his paſt Sins, ſo alſo out of his infinite Bounty and Goodneſs, which is as it were the peculiar Character of the Divine Nature, he reſolved to reward his pious Actions.

Verſ. 18. Τίς οὖν μού ἐστιν ὁ μισθός;] That is, διὰ τί, *for what* does God propound to me a reward? Not ſimply for preaching the Goſpel, but for preaching it *gratis*, ſo as to be able to ſay I never uſed the Power I had, to take Mony of my Hearers to maintain me. So that I ſhould render this interrogation: *of what ſort then is my Reward?* i.e. what is the condition of the Reward that God propoſes to me. Which I think is better than to interpret ἵνα which follows by *if* or *when*, tho I confeſs the ſignification of that as well as other Particles is various. The word μισθὸς here, tho ſet without any addition, muſt be obſerved to ſignify an extraordinary Reward, greater than that which ſhould be conferred on all that preached the Goſpel; for they might

Chapter IX. all expect from God some degree of Reward, upon the performance of their Office, tho they did no more than what they were necessarily obliged to.

Vers. 25. *Note* h. I have several Animadversions to make upon this foregoing Annotation. I. That the *Doctor* did not sufficiently understand the meaning of the word ἀναγκαζαλα, when he supposed it to signify a custom of the *Athletæ*, "*In forcing themselves to eat, that* "*by that means they might become fleshy and corpulent.* For the *Athletæ* did not strive to make themselves fat or thick beyond measure; because that would have lessened their Activity, and been a great hindrance to them both in Cuffing and Running; but they endeavoured to get such a habit of Body as was requisite for the well performing of those Exercises, *i. e.* to become strong and nimble: For which purpose the *Gymnasiarchæ*, or *Masters of the Games*, did prescribe to them the eating of certain Meats, and such a proportion of them at stated times; and it was not lawful for them to use any other sort of Diet, or to eat how and when they pleased, but they were bound to follow anothers prescriptions. And this is the meaning of the word ἀναγκαζειν, and not to *cram* themselves *per force*, as the thing it self will afterwards shew. *Lucian* in *Lib.* περὶ Γυμνασίων describes the *Athletæ*, or those that often exercised themselves in these sort of *Games*, thus: ὔτε ῥικνοὶ, ϗ κατισχνασμένοι, ὔτι ἀπεπλησθῆς ἐς βάρος, ἀλλ' ἐς τὸ σύμμετρον ἀπηγγεγραμμένοι· τὸ μὲ ἀχρεῖον ϗ σαρκῶν, ϗ ἄκαιρον τοῖς ἱδρῶσιν ἐξανηλωκότες: *they are neither shrivelled or wasted away, nor yet so extraordinary big as to be heavy, but of a just size; the useless and superfluous parts of their Flesh having been consumed in Sweat.* See also what follows.

II. Our learned Author seems to owe the greatest part of what he here says to *Pet. Faber*, or *Hier. Mercurialis*; whom he also hastily perhaps looked over, and collected as much as he had occasion for about the ἀγῶνες of the *Grecians*, out of the works of those Writers. For by his citation of some Passages, it appears that he did not look into the Authors themselves, out of which they are taken. The place alledged out of *Lucian*, is in *Dialogis mortuorum*, p. 279. *Ed. Amst.* and it is not *Charon*, but *Mercury* that is there represented, as afraid of letting *Damasias* with so much Fat about him come into his Boat; which yet we are not to understand was so much neither as to hinder his Activity, as if he had been a Man that had minded nothing but his Belly. The passage cited out of *Julian* does not shew that the *Athletæ* ate immoderately, but only certain Meats, in a certain quantity, and at a certain time; which would be very inconvenient for an Emperor, especially when journeying, or engaged in important Affairs, who must

must eat, ὑπηδὲν αἱ πρᾶξεις ἢ καιρὸν ἐνδῶσιν: *when Business will permit.* Chapter IX.

III. If our Author had looked into *Suidas*, or at least not read him negligently, he would have alledged his definition of ἐγκράτεια, which shews what that word properly signifies: It is διάθεσις, saith he, ἀνυπέρβατος τῶ κατ' ὀρθὸν λόγον: *a disposition which will not suffer a Man to go in any thing beyond reason:* καὶ ἧττον ἡδονῶν, *and a Habit which cannot be conquered by Pleasures:* So that ἐγκρατὴς is one that has such a power over his Passions, as to abstain from those things which he judges hurtful to him, notwithstanding the pleasantness of them. And accordingly where the discourse is about an *Athleta*, who is said πάντα or κατὰ πάντα ἐγκρατεύεσθαι, the meaning is, that he is one who in all things is so much his own Master, as to eat nothing, and do nothing which may impair his Strength. Which the Apostle did in another sense, who governed his Affections so as not to gratify them in any thing, tho lawful, that might in the least hinder the propagation of the Gospel.

IV. The place in *Ælian* is absurdly thus quoted by our Author: *So Ælian of the Tarentinus Luctator*; as if the *Luctator*'s name had been *Tarentinus*, whereas he was called *Iccus*, and *Tarentum* was the name of his Country. I shall set down the words of *Ælian* entire, which are these: ὅτι Ἰκκὸς ὁ Ταραντῖνος πάλης ὑπήρξατο σωφρονέστερον ἢ ὁ ἄθλησις χρόνον διέζησας, καὶ ΚΕΚΟΛΑΣΣΕΝΗ ΤΡΟΦΗ διαιτώμενος, καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἀμαθὴς διατελέσας: *Iccus the Tarentinian was a* Luctator, *who lived soberly all the time of his combating, and used to eat moderately, and abstained to the last from Venery.* See *Joach. Kubnius* on the words put in *Capital* Letters, who by other Testimonies proves that the *Athletæ* lived quite differently from what the *Doctor* imagined.

V. Our Author erroneously thought that the word πάντα in this place of St. *Paul* was governed by the Verb ἐγκρατεύεται, whereas the *Preposition* κατὰ is understood, and the words ought to be rendred, *is temperate in all things*, or *with relation to all things*. Which *all things* must be understood, according to the subject matter, of those things which were capable of weakning, if the Discourse be about an *Athleta*; and if about St. *Paul*, of those things which might obstruct the course of the Gospel.

Vers. 26. *Note* 1. Παγκράτιον was an exercise performed by the Combatants standing, whereas they often strove on the Ground, as we are told by *Lucian* in Dial. περὶ γυμνασίων, and fighting both with their Hands and Feet. *So*, in that Book, *Anacharsis* after he had described the Combatants in Sand and in Clay, represents them: οἱ δὲ ὀρθοὶ διαμαχόμενοι, καὶ ἀνατὶ πάσαν ἀλλήλους σφενδονῶντες, καὶ λακτίζοντες: *and these standing upright and all covered with Dust, strike and kick one another.* And

Chapter X. *Solon* a little after, reciting the names of the Exercises which *Anacharsis* had described, is brought in as speaking thus: Τῶν γυμνασιῶν δὲ τούτων, τὸ μὲν ἐν τῷ πηλῷ ἀκίνητος, πάλη καλεῖται· οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ κόνει παλαίοντες καὶ ἀνιπτί· τὸ δὲ παίειν ἀλλήλους ὀρθοὶ δὴν πυκτικάζειν λέγομεν: *Of these Exercises, that which is performed in that Clay is called Wrestling: And those in the Dust do also wrestle, but their striking one another standing upright, we call* πυκτικάζειν. Of these saith *Suidas*: ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ ποσὶ πυκτιμαχοῦσι, *they fight with their Hands and Feet*; in which kind of combat they used to exert all their Strength.

Ibid. *Note* m. The place cited out of *Eustathius* is not in his παρεκβολαὶ on *Iliad* Ε, but *Iliad* Υ. *pag.* 1215. *Ed. Rom.* and if Dr. *Hammond* had took it out of the Author himself, he would have set it down intire, because it may help us to understand St. *Paul*'s words. *Homer* had said of *Achilles*, who had endeavoured thrice to strike *Hector* to no purpose: τρὶς δ' ἧκεν πλῆξε βαθείαν, *thrice he struck the thick darkness*, with which *Apollo* had covered *Hector*; ἐξ ἧς, saith *Eustathius*, εἰλῆφθαι παροιμία λοιδ τὸ, ἀέρα δαίζειν, ὅτι τῷ ἀπράκτοις ἐγχειροῦντων· τινὲς δέ τι καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πυγμάχων τὴν παροιμίαν παροιμίαν εἰρῆσθαι λοιδόν· οἱ πολλάκις ἐκ ἐυσοχοῦντες, μάτην κινεῖν τὰς χεῖρας: *From whence the Proverb* to beat the Air *seems to be taken, which is applied to Persons who undertake impracticable things. But some think this Proverb was taken from Cuffers, who often*, &c.

Vers. 27. *Note* n, and o. I have confuted Dr. *Hammond* on *Rom.* vi. 6. where he endeavours, to no purpose, to prove that σωμὰ μῦ signifies *my self*: and therefore what he here says upon that Hypothesis is all vain. Besides, it is refuted by what he himself adds last of all in this place; for it is the Body that is subdued by bodily exercises, and not the Mind, any further than as the Body being once subdued, the Mind is no longer infected with those evil Affections which arise from the Body.

CHAP. X.

Vers. 1. *Note* a: *Col.* 1. *Lin.* 19. AFTER the words, *to do them.*] What our Author here says about the symbolical signification of the Wings of the *Cherubims*, he ought to have confirmed by some express Testimony out of *Moses* or the Prophets; for it is not necessary to think that God had a respect to all those things in instituting of the Mosaical Rites, which learned Men conjecture he might have a respect to. An infinite number of such things were of old fancied by the *Fathers*, who thought they might say what they pleased in this kind, tho they had no ground for it; and as many more

more are every day invented by our late Divines, which if denied, they can bring no Argument to make them appear probable. As to the *known saying* which Dr. *Hammond* ſpeaks of among the *Jews*, that is taken from a paſſage in *Moſes*, which is in his laſt Song in *Deut.* xxxii. 11. in theſe words: *As an Eagle ſtirreth up her Neſt, fluttereth over her young, and ſpreadeth abroad her Wings; ſo the* [Lord] *took him* (*viz.* the People of the *Jews*) *and bore him upon his Wings.* Which place is at large illuſtrated by *Sam. Bochart*, in *Hieroz.* Part. 2. Lib. 2. c. 3. Chapter X.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 7. after the words, *that followed them.*] Any one may ſee that this is a *forced* interpretation, which ſeems to be grounded only on this, that St. *Paul* ſays the *Iſraelites* were *under a Cloud*; as if they could not have been ſaid *to be under a Cloud*, if the Cloud had lain only on the foremoſt part of the Camp. *Rabbi Eliezer* never ſaw that Cloud, or knew any thing about this matter, no more than the reſt of the pretending Tribe of *Rabbies*, but what they could collect from *Moſes*, who has no ſuch thing. But, ſaith our Author, the protection of God will be better repreſented by a Cloud encompaſſing the Camp, than only going before it. That I utterly deny, for the Divine Protection was ſufficiently ſignified by a perpetual ſymbol of his Preſence whatever it was, if it could but be ſeen by all; and we are not to change ſtories written in the plaineſt words, into intolerable improprieties, to make them expreſs what we would have them.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Lin.* 24. after the words, *under thy Wings*, &c.] *A pillar of Cloud* cannot be otherwiſe underſtood than of an oblong Cloud, which like a Pillar ſuſpended in the Air, was viſible to all the *Iſraelites*: And *under* it might be ſaid to be, not only thoſe over whom it hung *perpendicularly*, but alſo who were placed *on every ſide* of it. As *under the conſtellation of the Crab* are ſaid to be, not only thoſe to whom that Conſtellation is *vertical*, but alſo all the *Ethiopians*: So that what our Author dreamt in order to explain this Phraſe, like other Dreams, has no truth in it. The phraſe *under the ſhadow of his Wings* is not, as I have already ſaid, taken from a Cloud, but from the cuſtom of Birds, who uſe to defend their tender Brood againſt the heat of the Sun with their Wings.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Col.* 3. *Lin.* 17. after the words, *mention of both.*] St. *Paul* rather ſeems here to make mention of the *Cloud*, as afterwards he does of the *Fire*, becauſe he intended to allude to the Chriſtian Baptiſm, which is more reſembled by a *Cloud*, that is, a watry Vapour, than by Fire.

Chapter X.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Lin.* 39. after the words, *were by the other.*] This paſſage in *Moſes* is miſunderſtood, as I have ſhewn in my *Diſſert. de trajectu maris Idumæi*, and I ſhall not here repeat what I have there ſaid, which overthrows all that the *Doctor* here diſcourſes.

Ibid. In that *Note*, *Lin.* 56. after the words, *belongs to the Fathers.*] The miraculous paſſage of the *Iſraelites* through the *Red-Sea*, and the Cloud going before them, were undoubtedly ſignal Evidences of the love of God to that People, as the thing it ſelf ſhews; but that they are to be look'd on as a tacit Declaration from the *Iſraelites* to yield Obedience to God, I ſhould hardly grant; and it is certain there is nothing either in the Scripture-Hiſtory, or in the thing it ſelf upon which ſuch a Suppoſition can be grounded. Theſe ſort of things are only the products of a fruitful Invention, which if they be look'd on as Demonſtrations, what will not Divines find in the Scripture? The *Iſraelites* are ſaid to have been *baptized in the Cloud* and *in the Sea*, becauſe the Cloud that hung over them, and the Sea that encompaſſed them, were Water, which may be reckoned as it were to have wet them, becauſe of its nearneſs; as we are waſhed by the Water of Baptiſm. Beſides this reaſon, taken from the nature of the thing it ſelf, all others are mere Trifles and Niceties, and have no more truth in them than what our Author ſays about the Cloud environing the *Iſraelites* on every ſide, or the Sea's being divided in the form of a Semicircle.

Ibid. At the end of that *Note.*] Here our Author, for the ſake of his *Gnoſticks*, ſays a great many forced things, and ſhews himſelf a very unfortunate Critick. For *1ſt*, the Paſſage he has a reference to in *Irenæus*, is in *Lib.* 1. *c.* 9. but there is nothing there about the Cloud or Sea, which may illuſtrate this place in St. *Paul:* He ſays only that the Diſciples of *Marcus* believed, διὰ τὸν ἀπολυτρωσιν ἀκατάληπτους καὶ ἀοράτους γίνεσθαι τὴν κτίσιν: *that by their Redemption they became incapable of being taken or ſeen by a Judg.* Which *Irenæus* compares to *Pluto*'s *Helmet* in *Homer.*

2. It is true indeed, that the Sect of *Marcus* was a branch of the *Valentinians*, yea of the *Gnoſticks* too; for, as *Irenæus* afterwards ſays, theſe Men called themſelves τέκνα γνώσεως *the Children of Knowledg:* but will it thence follow that they added nothing, nor took away any thing from the dotages of the *Gnoſticks*, that we ſhould be able to affirm for certain, that whatever the followers of *Marcus* ſaid, was truly attributed to the antient *Gnoſticks*, who lived in the time of the Apoſtles? I think not.

3. Our

3. Our Author ſhould have produced ſome plain Teſtimony to prove that thoſe antient *Gnoſticks* made themſelves parallel to the primitive *Jews*, and that in thoſe things which St. *Paul* here mentions: for otherwiſe, whilſt he produces only ſlight Conjectures, I don't know who is bound to believe them. Chapter X.

Verſ. 2. Πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο.] Our Author did not underſtand the meaning of this Phraſe, nor is there any thing ſaid about it in *Grotius*, whom he follows ſometimes right or wrong. Baptiſm being a Ceremony of initiation, whereby he that received it, openly teſtified his willingneſs to be accounted his Diſciple whoſe diſcipline he ſubmitted himſelf to; *to be baptized into Moſes*, is no more than to profeſs in Baptiſm, whether true or metaphorical (as that is whereof the Apoſtle here ſpeaks) his reſolution to become the diſciple of *Moſes*, and is all one as if St. *Paul* had ſaid *to be baptized into the name of Moſes*; of which phraſe I have ſpoken before, on *Chap.* iii. 15. of this Epiſtle, and *Mat.* xxviii. 16.

Verſ. 3. Τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον.] The word πνευματικὸς here is oppoſed to φυσικὸς *natural*, not to σωματικὸς *corporeal*; for Manna was a *corporeal* Food, which could not be called ſpiritual in any other reſpect than as it was prepared, not by ſenſible Cauſes, but by Spirits, *viz.* Angels, whoſe Bread therefore it is ſaid to be in *Pſal.* lxxviii. 2. I know the general Opinion is, that it is called *ſpiritual Food*, becauſe it repreſented, or alſo typified ſpiritual things. But *firſt* this ſhould be proved out of the Old Teſtament; for if it does not appear that the antient *Jews* had any ſuch apprehenſions of it, there is no reaſon to ſay that Manna ſignified or prefigured that which it does not appear the *Jews* underſtood by it. But it may be proved perhaps out of the New. If it be asked where? out of *John* vi. 31. & *ſeqq.* where Chriſt oppoſes his Doctrin to *Manna*: As if a mere alluſion or oppoſition put by Chriſt between his Doctrin and *Manna*, did neceſſarily imply that it was the deſign of God in giving the *Iſraelites* Manna, to typify the future promulgation of the Goſpel by Chriſt! But I further ask, for whoſe ſake were theſe typical repreſentations made? Was it for the ſake of the *Jews?* This cannot be pretended, for that dull Nation hardly underſtood the plaineſt and expreſſeſt things, tho frequently inculcated upon them, and much leſs ſuch as were obſcure and intricate. And it is not probable that any thing was inſtituted by God for the ſake of the *Jews*, which they did not at all underſtand. But that thoſe Types were given for the ſake of Chriſtians is yet far more unlikely; becauſe if they were to be believed by us, they were to be deduced from the Writings of the Apoſtles, whoſe Authority alone would move us in this.

Chapter X. this matter; when otherwise we should never have so much as dreamt of them. So that in order to our understanding that kind of Predictions, the assistance of other Divine Persons would have been necessary, whom for other reasons we already believe, *viz.* for the excellency of their Doctrin, and the Miracles which were wrought in confirmation of it. But this being supposed, what need is there of Types to those who already believe Christ and his Apostles upon the firmest grounds? They illustrate, it may be you'l say, the Apostles Doctrin; that I deny, and say that they would rather obscure it if they occurred in their Writings, for the alledged reasons: See my Note on *Mat.* ii. 2. Let the Learned judg of these things, and consider whether it be not better at last to let all this Doctrin about the Types alone, which the Heathens of old derided, and the *Jews* ridicule at this day; and only make use of the most convincing Arguments whereby to prove the truth of Christianity. But this would be the subject of a whole Volume, which I have here but transiently touched, intending wherever there is a fit occasion, to shew the weakness of all that is alledged in defence of Types out of the Apostles Writings.

Vers. 4. Ἔπινον ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας.] That is, of that spiritual *Water*, which God made to proceed *out of the Rock*, which *Water* followed the Camp. So *Gen.* iii. and elsewhere, *to eat of the Tree*, is to eat of the *fruit* of the Tree. Which must be carefully observed, lest any one think that the *Rock* it self is here properly called *spiritual*, that Epithet being to be attributed to the *Water* which flow'd out of the Rock, which tho not expressed, is yet to be understood: For no one will suppose that the Rock, from which the Water proceeded, followed the *Israelites*, or was carried about with them through the Wilderness. But granting, may some say, that the *Rock* is here put by a *Metonymy* for the *Water* that came out of it, yet how is it said that the *Water it self followed* the Jews? The common opinion is, that a little River or current of Water proceeding out of the *Rock* followed the Jewish Camp whithersoever it moved. But there is not one syllable about that in *Moses*, who yet it is not probable would have omitted the mention of so great a Miracle, if any such had been; for it would have been no small Miracle for God to have made a Channel for that Water to run in, and follow the *Israelites* whithersoever they went. But there is no need of feigning here a Miracle, in order to explain St. *Paul*'s words, which may be very well understood without it, *to wit*, by supposing only that this Water was carried about by the *Israelites* through the Deserts of *Arabia*, in leathern Bottles, or any other Vessels, that followed them with the rest of their Carriage.

For

For thus this Phraſe is uſed by *Ælian Var. Hiſt.* Lib. 12. Chap. 40. Chapter X. ἀεὶ δ' τῇ Ξέρξῃ ἐπομένων ἱρεῖων: *about the Convoy that followed Xerxes.* Which he begins thus: Τάττ ἄλλα ἱρεῖα εἵπετο τῇ Ξέρξῃ πλουτιλείας καὶ ἀλαζονείας πολλῆς μέτα· καὶ ὧν καὶ ΤΑΩΡ ΗΚΟΛΟΤΘΕΙ τὸ ἐκ τῆ Χοάσπ: *Among other Proviſions full of Magnificence and Oſtentation which followed Xerxes,* WATER *alſo* FOLLOWED *him out of* Choaſpes. And this was the Cuſtom of all the Kings of *Perſia*, if we believe *Herodotus*, Lib. 1. c. 188. Καὶ δὴ καὶ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῦ Χοάσπω ποταμῦ ἄμα ἄγεται, δ' ὃν μόνον Σῦσα ἵεται, δ' μέν πίνῃ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἄλλα ὑδατος ποταμῦ: *And they carry Water with them out of the River* Choaſpes, *that runs by* Suſa, *of which alone, and no other River the King drinks.*

Ibid. Ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός.] That is, ſaith *Grotius*, *prefigured Chriſt.* But it may every whit as well be interpreted: "And that which "might be ſaid of that Rock in a carnal ſenſe, may in a ſpiritual "be affirmed of Chriſt. As all the *Iſraelites* drank of the Waters of that Rock, and yet thoſe among them who rebelled, were deſtroyed in the Wilderneſs: ſo all are equally enlightned by the Doctrin of Chriſt, but whoever does not regulate his Life according to it, ſhall periſh. This is the ſenſe of the Apoſtle, which needs *no typical Prefiguration* to explain it, his Diſcourſe not being at all grounded thereon: or elſe this Paſſage may be rightly paraphraſed to the ſame ſenſe thus: "And the caſe was the ſame of the Water that flowed out "of that Rock, and thoſe that drank of it; and of the Doctrin of "Chriſt and Chriſtians. So in the Parables of Chriſt, the parts of the ὑποθέσεως are often called the parts of a *Parable*, becauſe they are compared with one another, and the caſe is the ſame in both: As *Mat.* 13. 19. *When any one heareth the word of the Kingdom, and underſtandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was ſown in his Heart:* THIS IS *he which received Seed by the way ſide. But he that received the Seed into ſtrong places,* THIS IS *he that heareth the Word*, &c. And it is known that the *Jews*, whom the Apoſtles followed, do very frequently borrow Compariſons from the Old Teſtament, and allude to the ſtories of it ſo, as often to apply the words of them to their purpoſe; not that they thought thoſe places contained prefigurations of that which they accommodated them to, but becauſe they thought it a piece of elegance to appear to take every thing out of the Old Teſtament. See *Gal.* iv. 24, 25, 26.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. Something, but briefly and obſcurely, there is about this matter in *Rabbi Solomon*, on *Numb.* xx. 2. perhaps taken from the Chriſtians; for it is not eaſily to be believed that all the late *Rabbins* ſay, they owe to antient Tradition. It's certain neither the

Paraphraſe

Chapter X. Paraphraſe of *Jonathan*, nor the *Jeruſalem Targum*, have any thing about the Water which followed the *Iſraelites*, on *Exod.* xvii. but in quite another place, *viz.* on *Num* xxi. 19, 20. where *Moſes* ſpeaks of a Well that was digged upon the border of the *Moabites*, the year before the *Iſraelites* entred into *Canaan*. The words of *Jonathan* are theſe: *And ever ſince the Well was given them in* Mattan, *it went up again with them into the high Mountains, and from the high Mountains it deſcended with them into the Hills. It encompaſſed all the Camp of* Iſrael, *and yielded it ſelf for every one to drink of at the door of the Tabernacle. It deſcended alſo with them out of the high Mountains into the low Vallies*, &c. The like we read in the *Jeruſalem Paraphraſe*, but with this difference, that there is nothing there ſaid of this Well encompaſſing the Camp, or breaking out at the Gate of the Tabernacle, as *Jonathan* affirms.

II. The *Jews* did not want Water, becauſe they both carried about with them the Water of *Horeb*, and might alſo meet with Springs in other places; for tho the *rocky Arabia* be a dry Country, yet it is not every where without Water, there being mention made of ſeveral Rivers which run through it. See my Notes on *Gen.* ii. 12.

III. What Dr. *Hammond* ſays about the Water's ceaſing to follow the *Jews*, upon the courſe of their Travels being changed, is a mere Invention, to ſupport his tottering Interpretation.

IV. If the Water of *Horeb* followed the *Iſraelites* without a Miracle, they muſt have all along journied near a Valley, in which it might have a free courſe after them, from the time of their departure from *Horeb*. But that is another of Dr. *Hammond*'s Fictions, which I need not ſay much about.

Verſ. 5. Τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐδόκησεν.] It is warily here ſaid by St. *Paul*, with the *Moſt* of them God was not well pleaſed, not with *all of them, except two*, as our Author ſays in his Paraphraſe, which is not true. See my Note on *Num.* xxiv. 65.

Verſ. 6. Τύποι ἡμῶν.] That is, the puniſhments inflicted on the rebellious *Iſraelites*, are ſo many examples which God propoſes to us, to take heed of falling into the like Sins. So alſo *verſ.* 11. St. *Paul* having again made mention of God's deſtroying the murmuring *Jews*, ſaith, ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον, *all theſe things happened unto them for examples, and were written for our Admonition*, &c. that is, God deſigned thoſe things for Examples, to be recorded in the Holy Scriptures, and propoſed as Warnings to every one that ſhould read them. They that render the word τύποι here by *in figura*, *in a Figure*, or *typice*, *typically*, muſt ſhew that God intended to *prefigure* the puniſhments of Sins by the puniſhments of the *Iſraelites*; which I ſuppoſe they will never

never be able to do. But it is certain this word τύπος is taken only in a threefold sense in the New Testament. Chapter X.

And *first* for any *Form*, whether corporeal, or conspicuous only to the Mind; which sense does not belong to this place. See *John* xx. 25. *Acts* vii. 43, 44. and xxiii. 25. *Rom.* vi. 17. *Heb.* viii. 5.

Secondly, It signifies an *Example*, as here and in many other places, as we shall presently see. The first signification of it is proper, this metaphorical. For τύπος is properly a *Figure* or *Form* into which any thing is *beaten* or *hammer'd*, τύπτειν. But because such figures were sometimes made to serve instead of patterns to others (in French, *pour servir de modelles*) therefore it was metaphorically applied to any sort of Figure or Example proposed to others for their imitation or warning. So *Phil.* iii. 17. *Brethren, be ye followers of me; and mark them which walk so, as ye have* τύπον ἡμᾶς *us for an example.* So 1 *Thess.* i. 7. *Ye were* τύποι *examples to all that believe in* Macedonia, *&c.* See also 2 *Thess.* iii. 9. 1 *Tim.* iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7. 1 *Pet.* v. 3.

Thirdly, In another metaphorical signification, because a Model or Pattern is *like* those things which are made according to it, the word τύπος in one place of St. *Paul* is taken for a thing which in some respect resembles another: And that is in *Rom.* v. 14. where *Adam* is said to be τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, that is, *like him that was to come*, viz. in this, that he alone had done something that was propagated to all Mankind, as Christ did something alone which extends to all Men. For in other things the Apostle observes not only a dissimilitude, but an opposition between them. But now who will believe that it was God's design, that *Adam* should first of all sin alone, and that that Sin should do mischief to all his Posterity, to prefigure what was to be done by Christ? Who was able to discern the Similitude before the Event? Who after the Event finds his Faith confirmed by that Similitude? Nor certainly was this the Apostle's meaning, but only that in the respect I have mention'd there was a Similitude between *Adam* and *Christ*, as there is between a τύπος and an ἀντίτυπος.

This last word perhaps may be made the ground of an Objection, which is twice found in the New Testament. The Author of the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*, Ch. ix. 24. denies that Christ was entred into Holy Places made with Hands, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, but that is, *which were made after the example of the true*, viz. Heaven, or which were the images of Heaven, not which prefigured Heaven. So Baptism is said in 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. to be ἀντίτυπον *to Noah's Ark*, that is, in some measure to resemble it. But no Man of sense would thence infer that it was

Chapter XI. God's intention by the Ark to prefigure Baptism, and reveal this Mystery which was before unknown by St. *Peter*.

Ibid. Εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν.] These words manifestly shew that τύποι ought to be rendred *Examples*, for Punishment is inflicted on guilty Persons, for an example to others not to imitate them; So that it is absurdly rendred by the *Vulgar* and *Erasmus*, *figura*, and as ill by *Beza*, *typi*; but rightly in *Castalio*, and in the *English* and *Geneva* Translations, *Examples*. Which being so, I wonder *Grotius* should speak here of *Prefigurations*.

Vers. 7. *Note* c. Notwithstanding all the *Doctor* has with so much care here put together, I rather think the place in *Exodus* here refer'd to, is to be understood of *Dancing* about the Golden Calf, on which place see my Notes, as also on *Gen.* xxi. I do not pay so great a deference to the *Rabbins*, as to take all which those Men fancy, to explain the Old Testament, for certain truth; nor perhaps would our Author himself have attributed so much to their Authority, if he had not resolved to force his *Gnosticks* here upon us.

Vers. 20. Δαιμονίοις δυσὶ καὶ οὐ θεῷ. The word δαιμόνιον in this place does not necessarily signify *Devils*, or *evil Spirits*; for the Heathens did not always sacrifice to evil Spirits, if we consider what were their true Thoughts. But the greatest part of their Idolatry consisted in this, that when they ought to have been θεοσεβεῖς, they were δεισιδαίμονες. And the Heathens also themselves have confessed that they did not offer sacrifice to *Gods*, but to *Demons*: As appears by the words of *Porphyry*, in Lib. 2. *de Abstinentia*: Οὐδὲ τοῖς Θεοῖς, ἀλλὰ Δαίμοσι, τὰς θυσίας, τὰς διὰ τῶν αἱμάτων ἐφεστίαζον οἱ τὰς ἐν τῷ παντὶ δυνάμεις καταμαθόντες, καὶ τοῦτο πεπίστευται παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεολόγων: *nor did those who knew the powers of the World offer bloody Sacrifices to the Gods, but to Demons; and this is affirmed* [in the Latin it is translated *creditur*, which is πεπίστευται] *by Divines themselves.*

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 4. *Note* a. IF it had been the Custom in capital Punishments, to cover the Heads only of Men and not of Women, our Author would have rightly deduced what St. *Paul* here says from that practice; but seeing there was no difference between Men and Women in this respect, why would it have *dishonoured the head* of a *Man* to have a Veil cast over him like a condemned Person, and not of a *Woman*? I rather think therefore that the Apostle had a respect only to the Custom of the Greeks, among whom it had been a disgrace for

for a Man to ſpeak publickly with his Head covered, and a Woman with her Head bare. Our Author's diſtinction between the Prepoſitions κατὰ and ἔχων will appear to be vain, if we compare *Mark* xiv. 3. and *Mat.* xxvi. 7. Chapter XI.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. Here our learned Author abuſes an impropriety in the *Septuagint*, to enlarge our Lexicons with new ſignifications of the word δόξα, as he does alſo elſewhere.

I. It is falſe that the Hebrew כבוד *chabod* ſimply taken, ſignifies *a Beam*, tho if it be added to the word *Sun*, it ſignifies its Splendor and Beams. It is falſe alſo, that becauſe the *Septuagint* have perhaps ſomewhere (tho I cannot tell where) improperly rendred what ought to have been tranſlated *a Beam* by δόξα, therefore the word δόξα ſignifies *a Beam*. To authorize that ſignification, it was requiſite they ſhould have frequently and induſtriouſly uſed the word δόξα to that purpoſe, and not raſhly before they were aware.

II. Nor is it true that the word כבוד was ever rendred by ἀπαύγασμα, or tho ἀπαύγασμα be metaphorically called δόξα, that thoſe words are promiſcuous. The *Doctor* ſhould have produced but one example, in which δόξα ſignified a *Beam* or *Splendor*. Beſides, is this Phraſe, *the Woman is the beam of the Man*, any thing plainer than this, is *the glory of the Man*, which he interprets by the former? But the truth is, what our Author here ſays is only a miſinterpretation of *Grotius*'s Note upon this place, to which I refer the Reader.

III. Δοξὰ χωὶς is uſed by the *Septuagint* for תמונה or that ſymbolical *likeneſs of God* which appeared in the Tabernacle, becauſe that uſed to be ſo called, and not becauſe δόξα ſignifies any Similitude, as well as the Hebrew word. There is nothing more deceitful than ſuch ſort of reaſonings, as the *Doctor* often makes uſe of in order to find out the ſignification of words, unleſs at the ſame time their Uſe and Analogy be regarded.

IV. Setting aſide what is ſaid about the *Glory of God* in the *Pentateuch*, which does not at all belong to this place, tho *Grotius* thinks otherwiſe; the Man is called the *Glory of God*, becauſe whoever looks upon a Man, will perceive him to be a piece of Workmanſhip worthy of the divine Majeſty, and give Glory to him upon that account. And the Woman is the glory of the Man, becauſe there is ſome ground for the Man to glory, when he conſiders that the Woman was formed out of his Body, and created for his Help and Aſſiſtance. The following Verſe does ſhew that by being his *glory*, the Apoſtle means that for which he was made, and we need not go any further to underſtand St. *Paul*'s Mind: The ſenſe of the whole place is, that

Chapter XI. the Man indeed ought to have his Head uncovered, becauſe God made him, as his other Works, to be beheld; and it is not for the glory of God, to have that Work of his hid by a Veil: but the Woman, which was made for the Man, ought to be veiled, becauſe ſhe is inferior to the Man, who uſes her as he pleaſes, and would have her veiled. It is for the Man's glory to have his Authority appear over the Woman, and as in other inſtances, ſo in this particularly, of having her conceal her ſelf whenever he pleaſes. *Solomon* has a ſaying in the xiith Chapter of *Proverbs*, verſ. 16. which according to the Verſion of the *Septuagint* is, Γυνὴ δίχρειστε ἀγαθὴ ἀνδρὶ δόξαν, δεῖγμα δὲ ἀπωλείας γυνὴ μισοῦσα δίκαια. And ſo ſaith *Eſdras*, Lib. 3. c. iv. 7. of Women: πολλοῖς δόξαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

But of this whole reaſoning, and many other ſuch, it muſt be obſerved, that they are not at all demonſtrative, becauſe they are not grounded upon things that are unchangeable, but alterable according to the Cuſtom or Opinion of Men. It was thought by the *Greeks* to be a token of the Mens Authority over the Women, for the Men to appear abroad with their Heads uncovered, as being their own Maſters, and expoſing themſelves to every ones view; and on the contrary an Argument of ſubjection in Women to go abroad veil'd, becauſe that ſignified them to be but one Man's, who had power to remove their Veil, and would not have them publickly beheld. But if a contrary Cuſtom had prevailed, St. *Paul* would have reaſoned quite otherwiſe, to perſwade the *Corinthians* to what he endeavoured to induce them, *viz.* to do all things decently in the Church, and wherever any one propheſied. I confeſs he grounds his Argument alſo upon the Hiſtory of the Creation; but if we conſider the thing, who can deny but that the Woman was created after the Image of God, and for his Glory as well as the Man? See *Gen.* ii. 27. Nor indeed is this denied by St. *Paul*, but only in a certain ſenſe, *viz.* as the Woman is ſaid to have been created after the Man, and to be an aſſiſtant to him. And in this ſenſe only his reaſoning is valid, and not by a general, and, if I may ſo ſpeak, mathematical deduction.

Verſ. 10. *Note* d. The *Rabbi* cited by *Schickard* was not a *Talmudical Doctor*, but only *cited* a place out of the *Talmud*, as we may ſee by the words that *Schickard* alledges.

Ibid. *Note* e. About this difficult place of Scripture, I have written two years ago two Letters in anſwer to a Friend, who deſired to have my Opinion of it, which I ſhall here propoſe to the Readers examination, declaring my ſelf ready to alter it whenever I ſee ſufficient reaſon. That part of thoſe Letters which relates to this matter is as follows.

I. I ſhall never forget that advice of St. *Auſtin*, than which nothing in ſuch matters can be more ſeaſonably call'd to mind: *That in things obſcure and remote from our ſenſes, if ſo be we read any thing in Holy Scripture, which may without endangering the Faith we profeſs, be made to comply with different Opinions, we ſhould not raſhly eſpouſe any of them; or if we do, yet not ſo as to reſolve not to change our Judgment whatever light be offer'd to us afterwards, or to contend not ſo much for the ſenſe of the Holy Scriptures, as our own Opinion, as the true ſenſe of the Scripture, when it is our own, whereas we ought rather to make that to be ours which is the aſſertion of the Scripture.* I have ſet down the whole Paſſage at length, to ſhew you that I am not ſo wedded to my preſent Opinion in this matter, as to reſolve that no reaſons ſhall move me to forſake it. Two things muſt here in the firſt place be obſerved. *Firſt*, that the Diſcourſe in 1 *Cor.* xi. is about Men and Women praying, or propheſying among others at home: For the Women among the *Greeks* did not appear abroad without a Veil, nor therefore ſtand in need of the Apoſtle's Admonition, which no honeſt Matron ever acted contrary to. And that ſome of their Neighbours or Acquaintance were preſent with them in thoſe Exerciſes is manifeſt; becauſe it is abſurd for a Woman praying by her ſelf to cover her Head, or to propheſy alone. *Secondly*, that as far as the *fifteenth Verſe*, the chief ſcope of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe is to ſhew the *Corinthian* Women, they ought not to propheſy or pray when Men were preſent, without being veiled. Theſe two things I take here for certain, becauſe they offer themſelves to the Readers Mind at firſt view. After therefore St. *Paul* had alledged Reaſons to that purpoſe, at the 10*th* Verſe he concludes thus: Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, *For this cauſe ought the Woman to have upon her Head*, what? *viz.* a Veil, which the Apoſtle calls ἐξουσίαν, as the *Jews* רדיר from רדר *dominatus eſt*, of which ſee Dr. *Hammond*, and my Notes on *Gen.* xxiv. 64. If St. *Paul* had added nothing more, there would have appeared no defect in his Diſcourſe; but there follow three words which have extremely perplexed Interpreters, becauſe they ſeem to be altogether ſuperfluous, and to have no dependence upon what goes before. And indeed if *in the Concluſion*, as *Logicians* ſpeak, *there ought to be nothing but what is contained in the Premiſes*; either it muſt be ſhewn that the ſenſe of theſe words is couched in what went before, or we muſt acknowledg them to be ſupervacaneous: and to me the former ſeems to be very eaſy, as it is certainly the beſt, if we do but inſtead of διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, which is manifeſtly not contained in the Premiſes, read διὰ ΤΗΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΙΑΣ, that is, when ſhe declares the Revelations made to her, or while ſhe is delivering her ἀγγελία. So a

Chapter XI.

prophetical

Chapter XI. prophetical Doctrin, which *Isaiah*, Chap. xxviii. 9. calls שמועה *schmouba*, is ſtiled by the *Septuagint* ἀγγελία. To which I might add a paſſage out of *Herodotus*, where the word ἀγγελία ſeems to be taken in the ſame ſignification; but becauſe it is obſcure, and St. *Paul* did not learn from him to ſpeak Greek, I ſhall abſtain from it. But you will ask me, I ſuppoſe, how it came to paſs that ἡ ἀγγελίας was changed into τὸν ἀγγέλων; To which I anſwer, becauſe ὁ ἄγγελος is a word much more common in Scripture than ἡ ἀγγελία which occurs but once in all the New Teſtament, and not often in the Old. And many times it happen'd that the Tranſcribers ſubſtituted a more uſual and familiar word in the room of one leſs known, as St. *Jerom* thought of the Name *Iſaiah*, which occurs in *Mat.* xiii. 35. The Apoſtle adds διὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας, becauſe it was not neceſſary for the Woman to cover her ſelf with a Veil at home, but only when ſhe went abroad, unleſs there was this or the like reaſon for it. They that make the diſcourſe here to refer to the Church, do not remember that it was unlawful for Women, covered or uncovered, to ſpeak in the Church, as St. *Paul* teaches in this ſame Epiſtle, *Chap.* xiv. 34. But at home amongſt their Acquaintance nothing hinder'd but they *might* propheſy, if they had received that Gift from God; but they ought to have their Heads covered, as when they appeared in publick. This is my conjecture about this place, which I ſhall not abandon till I meet with ſomething more probable.

II. It is a place of that nature, that as by its obſcurity it opens a door for Conjectures, ſo likewiſe it leaves room for innumerable Difficulties; and it is no wonder that very great ones are objected againſt this of mine, which would not be a conjecture if thoſe who are of another opinion could bring no probability againſt it. Nevertheleſs what you alledg, I ſhall conſider as briefly as I can. 1. You ſuppoſe the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe here to refer to publick Aſſemblies, in which all or moſt of the Chriſtians of the Church of *Corinth* met. But it is plain St. *Paul* forbids Women to ſpeak in publick Aſſemblies, either covered or uncovered, αἱ γυναῖκες ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΙΣ σιγάτωσαν. But in private Converſation, ſay you, it does not ſeem probable that the Spirit of Prophecy was given: Why ſo? It's true, the principal uſe of it was in Churches, but it might be uſeful alſo ſometimes in private Converſation amongſt familiars, for Chriſtians to edify one another privately. And it is certain, Women had it not to preach, *that* being not allowed them by the Apoſtle. 2. But you ſay, tho it was not lawful for Women to teach others, yet they might ᾄδειν, that is, *ſing* in the Church, as the learned *J. Mede* interprets that word.

word. I do not deny but the Hebrew התנבא in the Old Teſtament has that ſignification, and is rendred by the Greek Interpreters προφητεύειν, but in the New Teſtament I do not know of any place wherein that word is ſo taken, and in this diſputation of St. *Paul* I am ſure that ſignification does no where agree to it. 3. That the fault of the *Corinthian* Women lay in their coming to Church with their Hair all looſe, is no where intimated by St. *Paul*, who would have much more vehemently inveighed againſt Chriſtian Women that ſhould have imitated the ὑποφήτιδας ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων, *the Propheteſſes* or *Interpreters* of impure Spirits. He does not ſay one word about their Hair being looſe or bound up, but ſpeaks only of a *Veil*. 4. But why did the Apoſtle call the pious Diſcourſes of the *Corinthian* Women, ἀγγελίας, and not προφητείας or predictions? In anſwer to that, I acknowledg that the latter was the moſt common word, but the former alſo was uſed, as I have ſhewn. And then προφητεία ſignifies, at leaſt for the moſt part, the *thing* it ſelf propheſied, not the *act* of propheſying; but ἀγγελία not only the thing declared, but the Action it ſelf, or Office of declaring, if we believe *Euſtathius* on *Iliad* Λ. *verſ.* 140. where by ἀγγελία he thinks that *Homer* means ἡ ἐξ ἀποστολῆς πρᾶξις. And in this place I did not ſay that by ἀγγελία was meant the ſpiritual Gift of Prophecy, but either Prophecy, or the action it ſelf of propheſying of what kind ſoever that be, which the Apoſtle has chiefly a reference to; tho becauſe of their affinity they may be eaſily confounded, as the word κήρυγμα is taken both for the thing it ſelf preached, and for the Office or Action of preaching. 5. Another thing which you ſeem very much to ſtick at is, that this word ἀγγελία is but once uſed in all the New Teſtament: but conſider *firſt* that it is very common in *Homer*, *Xenophon*, and other Greek Writers, and therefore taken from the vulgar uſe. And then *ſecondly*, there are in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, as well as in other Authors, words that are but ſeldom uſed, as for inſtance περιφρονέω in *Chap.* xiii. 4. of this Epiſtle, καταναρκάω in 2 *Cor.* xi. 9. and ſeveral others which learned Men have taken notice of. 6. You add that in *verſ.* 16. the Apoſtle draws an Argument from the Cuſtom of the *Churches*; but that Cuſtom does no more reſpect publick than private Aſſemblies; for the Apoſtle does not ſay, τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν ΕΝ ἐκκλησίᾳ, but οὐδὲ αἱ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΙ τοῦ θεοῦ. St. *Paul* here has a reſpect to the Cuſtom of the *Jews*, which the Apoſtles had introduced into Churches conſiſting partly of *Jews*, and partly of *Greeks*, together with other *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms. Hear what *Tertullian* ſays, *de Corona*, Chap. 4. *Among the Jews it is ſo ordinary for the Women to have their Heads covered, that they are diſtinguiſhed by it from others.*

Chapter XI.

Chapter XI. *others.* This is what I had to reply to your objections, which are so far from satisfying me, that they confirm me in my conjecture. If we had any Old Copy which instead of διὰ τὰς ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥΣ read διὰ τὰς ΑΝΔΡΑΣ, I should have no manner of doubt about this place, whatever others thought.

Vers. 14. *Note* f. I. I have at large shewn in my *Ars Critica*, P. 2. Sect. 1. c. vii. §. 6. that St. *Paul*'s meaning in *Ephes.* ii. 3. is this, that the *Jews* (meant by the word *us*, and not the *Romans*) were of as lewd and wicked a Disposition as other Nations.

II. But in this place to the *Corinthians*, the word *Nature* does not signify properly a Custom or Disposition, but is opposed to Instruction. It is just as if the Apostle should have said, Do not you know this of your selves? Do you want any one to teach it you? So the Latin *natura* is used by *Cicero* in Lib. 1. *Tuscul. Quæst.* where comparing the *Romans* with the *Greeks*, he saith: *Illa quæ* naturâ, *non litteris, adsequuti sunt neque cum Græcis, neque ulla cum Gente sunt conferenda. As to those things which they have acquired the knowledg of by Nature, not by Learning, they* (viz. the Romans) *incomparably go beyond the Greeks and all other Nations.* The same Author in *Philip.* 2. thus bespeaks *Antonius: An verebare, ne non putaremus* natura *te potuisse tam improbum evadere, nisi accessisset etiam disciplina? Were you afraid lest we should think you could not have arrived to such a pitch of wickedness by Nature, unless you had also been instructed?*

Vers. 29. *Note* g. I. The Hebrew קדש in the Book of *Joshua*, manifestly signifies *to consecrate*, the Discourse being about places of Refuge, which were esteemed Sacred. The *Septuagint* unnecessarily expressed the sense, rather than the proper meaning of the word; for the Cities consecrated for places of Refuge, were by that Consecration *distinguished* διεστάλθαι from others. But hence it does not follow that διαστέλλειν or διακρίνειν signifies reciprocally *to sanctify*.

II. The Apostle's sense is best interpreted by those who affirm this to be an *Elliptical* Phrase, and the meaning of it to be, *not discerning the Lord's Body,* ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄλλου ἄρτου, *from other Bread*; or not eating the Consecrated more reverently than any common Bread. In the 31st *verse* we have the same expression again; for if we did but distinguish (διακρίνομεν) our selves, we should not be condemned; that is, if we distinguished those that were not rightly disposed or qualified, from those that were; εἰ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέσεως διακρίνομεν διεκρίνομεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων διαπίνοντων. To look here for any thing else, is to seek a knot in a Bulrush.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Verſ. 2. Εἰδωλα ἄφωνα.] I do not often find fault with our Author's Paraphraſe, tho in a great many places the mind of the Apoſtles might have been more fitly expreſſed. I am contented if he does but any how interpret the ſenſe. But his Paraphraſe of this Verſe is intolerable; for the Heathens did not believe that their Idols ſpake of themſelves, or that their Prieſts anſwered them of their own Heads, but were both moved by the Gods, whoſe Prieſts and Statues they were: So that the two firſt could not be charged upon them, and all that could be objected againſt them was, that it was not any *God*, as they ſuppoſed, that anſwered them by their Idols, but an evil Spirit. But the Apoſtle does not upbraid them ſo much as with that in this place, but only that they had formerly ſuffered themſelves by their own blindneſs to be led to the worſhip of Idols, which gave no anſwers to them that enquired of them, either by their Prieſts or by evil Spirits; but were ſhamefully deceived by their crafty Prieſts, who pretended themſelves to be acted by the Spirit of the Gods, or by mere human artifice impoſed on the credulous, ſo as to perſwade them that Images could ſpeak, which were εἴδωλα ἄφωνα. And ſuch ſort of Men were very unfit to diſtinguiſh between true Inſpiration and feigned, which therefore the Apoſtle here teaches them how to do. I confeſs Dr. *Hammond* had *Grotius* to go before him, but the thing it ſelf confutes him.

Verſ. 4. Τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα.] This place was imitated by St. *Clement* in his 1 *Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 46. Οὐχὶ ἓν θεὸν ἔχομεν, καὶ ἓν χριστὸν, καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μίαν κλῆσιν ἐν χριστῷ; *Have we not one God and one Chriſt, and one Spirit of Grace given unto us, and one calling in Chriſt?*

Verſ. 12. Καθάπερ τὸ σῶμα ἕν ἐστι.] This Similitude alſo is uſed by the ſame St. *Clement* more than once, in the forementioned Epiſtle, and among other places in *Chap.* 36. Οἱ μεγάλοι δίχα τῶν μικρῶν οὐ δύνανται εἶναι, οὐδὲ οἱ μικροὶ δίχα τῶν μεγάλων· σύγκρασίς τίς ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἐν τύποις χρῆσις. Λάβωμεν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν· κεφαλὴ δίχα τῶν ποδῶν οὐδὲν ἐστιν, ὕτως οὐδὲ οἱ πόδες δίχα τῆς κεφαλῆς· τὰ δὲ ἐλάχιστα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν ἀναγκαῖα καὶ εὐχρηστά ἐστιν ὅλῳ τῷ σώματι· ἀλλὰ πάντα συμπνεῖ, καὶ ὑποτάσσῃ μιᾷ χρῶνται εἰς τὸ σωζεσθαι ὅλον: *The great cannot be without the ſmall, nor the ſmall without the great; there is a kind of mixture in all things, and every thing has its uſe. Let us take for inſtance our Body. The Head without the Feet is nothing, nor the Feet without the Head. The*

Chapter XII. *ſmalleſt parts of our Bodies are neceſſary and uſeful to the whole Body; but they all conſpire and jointly ſubſerve the preſervation of the whole.*

Verſ. 13. Εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν.] That is, we were baptized that we might be called by one name, of one Society, the Church of Chriſt. See my Note on *Chap.* x. 2.

Ibid. Ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.] Having ſpoken before of Baptiſm, which is performed with Water, the Apoſtle here keeps to the ſame Metaphor, and ſays, that Chriſtians *had drank of the ſame Spirit.* Which is to be underſtood both of the Spirit of Miracles, and of the Spirit of Chriſtianity. Such another Metaphor is made uſe of by *Cebes* in the beginning of his *Table*, where he feigneth Ἀπάτην τὰς εἰσπορευομένας εἰς τὸν βίον ποτίζειν τῷ ἑαυτῆς δυνάμει, *Impoſture making thoſe who enter into Life to drink of her power.*

Verſ. 28. *Note* d. I. Of the difference between a *Teacher* and a Prophet, ſome things muſt be further obſerved, which our Author having omitted has left us not a little in the dark about this matter. The *Prophets* under the Old Teſtament had a twofold Office: The firſt and higheſt conſiſted in declaring thoſe things which they had received immediately from God, or by the mediation of Angels, and were ſuch as could not have been known by Men, without a Divine Revelation: The other was to perſwade Men to the obſervation of the Law already revealed, by pious Exhortations, Reproofs and Counſels. And to this ſeems to belong thoſe Schools of the Prophets, ſo often mentioned in the Old Teſtament, and particularly in 1 *Sam.* xix. 20. 2 *Kings* iv. 38.

Becauſe the Worſhip of the only true God was to be firmly eſtabliſhed among the *Jews*, a generation of Men that chiefly regarded the things of this Life, and defended againſt the encroaching Idolatry of their neighbour Nations for ſeveral Ages, God ſaw it neceſſary to raiſe up Prophets, by inſpiring them in an extraordinary manner. And under the New Teſtament likewiſe, to eſtabliſh the Authority of the Apoſtles, God vouchſafed them and others the ſame extraordinary Inſpiration; but as the Chriſtian Religion grew and flouriſhed, and by growing acquired Strength, the gift of foretelling things to come was by degrees more ſparingly conferred. And becauſe Chriſtianity did not much regard what was to happen in this World, but put Men upon the thoughts and expectations of another Life, the principal Office of the New Teſtament Prophets lay in interpreting thoſe things more clearly and at large, which were revealed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, for the benefit of the common People.

In

In which Office there are two things to be carefully distinguished: *one* is, their preparation for the exercise of that Office, in which besides natural Gifts, and Knowledg acquired by Industry, they were endued with the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on them by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles, as appears from 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* And tho we do not know how the Holy Spirit influenced their Minds, or what change it produced in them; yet it appears by what is afterwards said about these Prophets by St. *Paul*, that this was the effect of that divine Inspiration, to fit them to preach the Gospel: Which *fitness*, ἱκανότης as St. *Paul* calls it, was all at once conferred upon them. Chapter XII.

And when they were thus made fit, ἱκανοὶ γενόμενοι, for this Office, they executed it not by a particular sort of Inspiration, by which such things were revealed to them as they knew not before, or which unaccountably and extraordinarily moved them to speak, but as they saw fit themselves; and those things which they had received from Christ and the Apostles, they interpreted after their own manner. Which was the ground of those Disorders and Tumults in the Church, of which St. *Paul* speaks in the 14*th* Chapter, when more Prophets than one would be heard at the same time. And hence this Gift did not supersede the necessity of Study and diligent reading, as appears by that advice of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*: *Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrin. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee*, &c. — *Meditate upon these things, give thy self wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all.*

These are they whom the Apostle calls *Prophets*; the *Teachers* seem to be those who had qualified themselves for preaching the Gospel only by Study, and had not received the extraordinary Gift of the Spirit. The *Prophets*, for the most part at least, did not teach by Inspiration, but had been *fitted* to teach by Inspiration; but these who are here peculiarly called *Teachers*, did not only teach without Inspiration what they had learned, but had received no extraordinary preparation from God for the exercise of their Office. In which particular they were inferior to the Prophets, besides that these did sometimes foretel things to come. Unless this Interpretation be admitted, it will be hard to understand any thing that St. *Paul* says afterwards about Prophets.

II. As for these *Teachers* in that Age having been always Bishops or Priests of the first Rank in the Church, I do not know whence that can certainly be concluded. I am sure what our Author alledges

Chapter XII. to that purpoſe, does by no means prove it; nor is there any reaſon from the thing it ſelf, which ſhould oblige us to be of his opinion.

Ibid. *Note* e. If the Apoſtles had ſhewn any other inſtances of ſeverity beſide that on *Ananias*, in the beginning of their Miniſtry, I do not think but St. *Luke* would have related them, and therefore I ſuppoſe they are other Miracles intended in *Acts* ii. 43. But why doth St. *Luke* ſay there was ſuch a general fear upon that account? *To wit*, becauſe that fear might as well follow upon beneficial Miracles, as puniſhments inflicted on wicked Perſons; for any Miracles joined with a pious and reaſonable Doctrin, are capable of impreſſing an aw upon the Minds of Men, and making them afraid to oppoſe the Teachers of it, leſt they ſhould *be found fighters againſt God*. This is a much better Interpretation, than to ſay that the Apoſtles terrified Men by inflicting Diſeaſes upon them, and menacing them with Death; which they very ſeldom did, and could not have been frequently done without giving a fair occaſion to the enemies of Chriſtianity to cavil both at the Apoſtles conduct, and it. And I as little believe that this power belonged to all Governors of Churches, which we read of none that uſed beſides the Apoſtles, and thoſe to whom the Apoſtles did as it were lend it, as St. *Paul* did to the *Corinthians*: See *chap.* v. But the *Doctor* thought he could never ſay enough about Church Cenſures.

Ibid. *Note* h. I. Of the word γλῶσσα, *Phil. Jac. Mauſſacus* has copiouſly and learnedly treated, in a *Diſſert.* premiſed to *Harpocration*, where he has at large ſhewn that γλῶσσαι ſignifies not only *Languages* in general, but *ſtrange Languages*, and words peculiar to certain Dialects, for the interpretation of which *Gloſſaries* were compoſed.

II. Tho it is ſaid in *Acts* ii. 5. that there were at *Jeruſalem* devout Men, *out of every Nation under Heaven*, who heard the Apoſtles ſpeaking in their own Languages; yet that expreſſion is not to be taken in the ſtricteſt and moſt comprehenſive ſenſe, becauſe it is certain *univerſal* Phraſes are often uſed for *indefinite* or *particular* ones, of which ſee my Notes on *Gen.* vii. 19. and *Part.* 2. *Sect.* ii. cap. vi. §. 16. of my *Ars Critica*. And indeed it is not at all probable that the *Apoſtles* could ſpeak all the Languages ſo much as of the *Aſian* People, among which were the *Scythians*, who inhabited a great and vaſt Country towards the North, and the *Seres* and *Japanners*, and divers *Indian* Nations, to which they never went. And therefore by *all Nations* and *all Languages* muſt be meant the moſt and moſt famous within the *Roman* Empire, and in bordering parts of the World: Tho I do not doubt but that if the Providence of God had called the Apoſtles to the moſt remote Countries, God would have miraculouſly conferred on them the knowledg

knowledg of their Languages. But it was time enough for that when they had occaſion to uſe them. Chapter XIII.

III. There are ſome things to be obſerved about the Gift of Tongues, which I ſhall afterwards ſet down, becauſe our Author has paſt it by.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 1. Ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν Ἀγγέλων.] St. *Paul* here ſeems to ſpeak according to the opinion of the Vulgar, who think that the Angels cannot communicate their Thoughts to one another without ſpeech; tho Spirits, whether pure, or clothed with another kind of Body, may have other ways to convey their Thoughts to each other: And thoſe ways altogether as conceivable as the manner how we underſtand one anothers Thoughts by Speech, which is *not at all*, as I might eaſily ſhew, if this were a proper place to philoſophize in: But I ſhall rather ſet down a paſſage out of *Michael Pſellus*, in his little Book *de operationibus Dæmonum*, where he deſcribes thus the manner of their diſcourſing: ὡς ὁ λέγων πόρρωθεν μὲν ὢν ἰσχυρότερος λέγειν πέφυκεν, ἀγγὺς δὲ γενόμενος εἰς τὸ τοῦ ἀκούοντος οὖς ψιθυρίζειν κατέφυγεν· καὶ οὐ ἔστιν αὐτῷ ἐντεῦθεν ἐπιτήδεια πνεύματα τὰ ψυχῆς ἰδιότης ἂν ἐλλιθῆ φέρειν, ἀλλ' ὧν χρὴ βάλλειν λόγον ἀφῶντα κελεύθου ἀφεὶς τὸ ἀνεχόμενον ἐγκρύπτουσιν, ἅ φασι καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ταῖς ἐξιούσαις εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὗται ἀσωμάτως ὁμιλεῖν ἀλλήλαις. Τῶν δὲ τὸ τρέπον καὶ δαίμονες πεπύστασι τὴν ὁμιλίαν λανθάνοντες, ὡς μηδ' ὑπόθεσιν ἡμᾶς ἔχειν ἐπαμυνεῖν συναισθάνεσθαι: *He that ſpeaks, if he be afar off, is forced to ſpeak very loud; but if he be near, he whiſpers what he has to ſay into the Ear of the Perſon he ſpeaks to. And if he could have an immediate acceſs to the ſpirit of the Mind, he would not need ſo much as to whiſper, but he might make himſelf be underſtood, and communicate whatever he had a mind by a ſecret way, without any noiſe; in the ſame manner as they ſay Souls do after their ſeparation from the Body, who converſe without making any ſenſible impreſſion on each other. And this way the Devils alſo diſcourſe with us* Men, *and wage war with us unperceived.* And afterwards he ſaith thus: Πλεῖστα μὲ ἰδίαν Δαιμόνων ἐφεξῆς ἐκ ἴσμεν, καὶν Ἑλληνίδα, καὶν Σύρον, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην βάρβαρον· τί γὰρ ἂν φωνῆς τοῖς ἄνευ φωνῆς ὁμιλοῦσιν, ἧς καὶ χρείαν ἔπειτα; *That* Demons *have any peculiar Language we ſhall not find*; for inſtance, *Hebrew or Greek, or Syriack, or any other barbarous* Tongue: *For what occaſion have they for Speech, who converſe together without Speech, as I before ſaid?* But he goes on and ſaith: Ἐπὶ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἐκ ἀγγέλων ἴθνη ἕτερα ἕτερα ἐφρόντισαν, ἄλλοι ἄλλοις συμπαραδεδώκασιν, ἴσως τοῖς ἐκείνων ἐξαιτοῦσι γλώτταις, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ τῶν οἱ μὲ παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἐγχωριάσαντες ἠρωϊκῶς,

Chapter XIII. ἡρώϊκῶς, οἱ δὲ περὶ Χαλδαίους πρὸς χλόμις εἶχον τὴ Χαλδαίων γνώτλη, &c. *But as among the Demons of the Nations, ſome preſided over one, and ſome over another, and had each their diſtinct place of Reſidence; ſo they ſeverally ſpake the peculiar Languages of thoſe Nations. For which reaſon thoſe of them that reſided in* Greece, *gave their reſponſes in Greek Heroick Verſes, and thoſe in* Chaldea *were invoked in the Chaldean Language*, &c. This as it is not ἀξιοπίστως *without any examination* to be admitted, ſo nor abſolutely I think to be rejected; wherefore I thought fit to ſet it down here, that the Learned might judg of it.

Ibid. *Note* a. There are ſeveral things in this Annotation which I cannot aſſent to, and are undoubtedly falſe.

I. From the order obſerved, in reckoning up the Conſort in *Pſalm* cl. it cannot be inferred that the *Cymbal* was a muſical Inſtrument of a bigger ſound than thoſe before named; for who told Dr. *Hammond* that the Diſcourſe aſcended? Does the *Pſalmiſt* uſe to be ſo exact in placing his words? They muſt have read the Pſalm but very careleſly that can think ſo.

II. The *Cymbal* cannot be ſaid to have been a *wind Inſtrument*. It was made in the form of a Hemiſphere, hollow within, and two Cymbals were ſhaken and ſtruck one againſt another, to make a ſound. "*If* "*any one ask me* (ſaith *Adr. Turnebus* in Adverſ. *Lib.* 26. c. 33.) *what* "*ſort of Inſtrument a Cymbal was, I will ſend him to the Herb* Cotyle- "don, Pennywort, *whoſe Leaves reſemble a Cymbal.* So ſaith *Scribonius* "*Largus*, Mentaſtrum vel radicem κοτυλήδονος, quæ herba ſimilia folia "Cymbalis habet, *Wild Mint, or the root of the Herb* Cotyledon, *the* "*leaves of which are like Cymbals.* He might have added, that this Herb was for that reaſon called κυμβάλιον, as appears by *Dioſcorides* in *Lib.* 4. c. 92. who gives this deſcription of it, and at the ſame time tells us what was the form of the Cymbal. Κοτυληδὼν, οἱ δὲ σκυτάλιον, οἱ δὲ κυμβάλιον φύλλον ἔχει ὅσπερ ὀξύβαφον, ἀκρωρείς, λειυθόπους κοῖλον: Cotyledon, *ſome call it* Scytalium, *others* Cymbalium, *hath a Leaf like a Sawcer, of a round ſhape, and gradually concave.* That the manner of ſounding theſe Inſtruments was by daſhing or ſhaking them againſt one another, appears by this Verſe of *Virgil* Georg. Lib. 4. *verſ.* 64. where he ſhews the way how to call back a ſwarm of Bees:

Tinnitusque cie & matris quate cymbala circum.

On which place *Servius* hath this Note, by whoſe words it will more fully appear what was the form of the Cymbal: *quæ* (viz. cymbala) *in ejus* (Matris Deûm) *tutela ſunt, quia ſunt ſimilia* HEMICYCLIS *cœli,*

cæli, quibus cingitur Terra, quæ eſt mater Deorum: Which are under her protection, becauſe they are like the half Circles of the Heaven, by which the Earth is encompaſſed, which is the Mother of the Gods. That they were ſhook together, we may learn alſo from the words of *Iſidore* in Orig. Lib. 2. c. 21. *Cymbala & acetabula quædam ſunt, quæ percuſſa invicem ſe tangunt & ſonum faciunt. Dicta autem Cymbala, quia cum ballematica ſimul percutiuntur. Ita enim Græci dicunt Cymbala ballematica. Cymbals are a ſort of Sawcers, which being ſtruck againſt one another, make a ſound. The reaſon why they were called Cymbals was becauſe,* &c. What the meaning of the word *ballematica* is I do not underſtand; but the word *Cymbal* muſt be derived not ἀπὸ τῦ συμβάλλειν, but ἀπὸ τῦ κύμβε, which ſignifies *concave*, as ἀπὸ τῦ κοίλου, κύμβαλον. Whence Cymbals are called concave by *Lucretius*, Lib. 2. ſpeaking of *Cybele*'s Prieſts:

Tympana tenta ſonant palmis & cymbala circum
Concava.

Nonius Marcellinus interprets *cymbaliſſare, cymbala quatere.* And it's certain they were uſed in Dances, as the Timbrels and Tabors, as appears by *Lampridius in Commodo: Præfectum Prætorio ſuum Julianum ——— ſaltare etiam nudum ante concubinas ſuas juſſit, quatientem Cymbala deformato vultu: He commanded his Præfect* Julian *to dance naked in the Court before his Concubines, ſhaking Cymbals, and with his Countenance diſfigured.* But the manner of ſounding Cymbals is beſt deſcribed by *Auſonius*, in Ep. 25.

Cymbala dant flictu ſonitum, dant pulpita ſaltu
Icta pedum, tentis reboant cava tympana tergis,
Iſiacos agitant Mareotica ſiſtra tumultus. *

III. The matter of theſe ſemicircular Inſtruments being Braſs, they made a *tinkling* or *ſhrill* ſound, not a *loud* or *big* one, as the *Doctor* thought; whence they are ſtiled ὀξυφθόγγα in the *Epigram* of *Alexis* Prieſt of the Mother of the Gods, of which I ſhall here produce theſe Diſtichs out of the *Anthol.* Lib. vi. p. 416. cap. 5.

Chapter XIII.

* *Since the Impreſſion of this I have obſerved that the learned* Laur. Pignorius *has printed Figures of Cymbals from the antient Marbles, exactly in the ſame form as I have deſcribed them.*

Σοὶ τήνδε θῆλυς Ἄλεξις ὧδε εἰσφήματα λύσας
Ἄνθετο, χαλκοτύπτε παυσίμηνθ' μανίης.
Κυμβαλα τ' ὀξύφθογγα, βαρυφθόγγων τ' ἀλαλητὸν
Αὐλῶν, ὃς μέσσῃ λοξὸν ἔκαμψε κέρας.
Τύμπανα τ' ἠχήεντα, καὶ αἵματι φοινιχθέντα
Φάσγανα, καὶ ξανθὰς τὰς πρὶν ἔσυεν κόμας.

The female Alexis *bequeaths this to thee, the mad tokens of her Fury, leaving off her braſs ſtriking Rage: Her ſhrill ſounding Cymbals, and high grave ſounding Pipes, which are made of the crooked Horns of a Calf: And her eccboing Drums and Swords died with Blood, and yellow Hair, which ſhe formerly ſhook.*

IV. *Heſychius* interprets the word χαλκόσιμα by καλκία, κύμβαλα, that is, *brazen Kettles, Cymbals*, as *Phavorinus* alſo reads it, not χάλκια κύμβαλα *brazen Cymbals*, as it is falſly quoted by our Author. And the reaſon why theſe Inſtruments are called χαλκόσιμα is becauſe they were *made of Braſs*, not becauſe they were πνευματικὰ *wind Inſtruments*.

V. The Epithet ἀλαλάζειν here proves nothing but that the Cymbal was an Inſtrument of a *ſhrill ſound*; and indeed two ſuch ſemicircular Inſtruments made of Braſs could not be beat one againſt another, without making a pretty great Ringing or Tinkling, which yet was not ſo great as to equal the ſound of Organs, eſpecially if of a large ſize. Hence *Xenophon*, in the beginning of his Book *de re Equeſtri*, compares the ſound of the hollow hoof of a Horſe to the ſound of a Cymbal: ὥσπερ κύμβαλον ψοφεῖ ὅταν τις τὴν διπόδα ἢ κοίλη ὀπλή: *a hollow Hoof ſtruck upon the ground makes a noiſe like a Cymbal.* Beſides the word ἀλαλάζειν ſignifies to make any ſort of confuſed noiſe, not only for Joy, but for Grief, as appears even from *Mark* v. 38. Conſult what *H. Stephanus* ſays about this word under its primitive ΛΑΛΕΩ, with which what is ſaid here by our Author is nothing to compare. So that St. *Paul* admirably reſembles the ſound of the words of an unknown Language to the confuſed noiſe of a Cymbal, or ἀλαλητὸν. Perhaps *Tiberius Cæſar* had almoſt the ſame reaſon for calling the *Grammarian Apio, Cymbalum Mundi, the Cymbal of the World*, viz. becauſe he dunned mens ears by his vain and unprofitable talking. See *Pliny*'s Pref. to his *Nat. Hiſt.*

VI. The uſe of the Cymbal does not belong to this place. The Apoſtle does not here reſpect the occaſions or times in which it was made uſe of, but only its confuſed ſound: However I ſhall in a few words here ſet down the uſe of that Inſtrument, becauſe our Author had

had not a true Notion of it. It was used whenever any confused noise was to be made, either as a signification of Joy or Mourning. For the antient Eastern People used that sort of Musick on both those occasions, whether in War or Peace. It was a token of Mourning in the sacred Solemnities of the Mother of the Gods, as we are told by *Martial*, Lib. 14. Epig. in *Cymbala*, 204. Chapter XIII.

Æra, Celænæos lugentia Matris amores,
Esuriens Gallus vendere sæpe solet.

Of which see the Additions of *T. Demsterus* to the *Rom. Ant.* of *Rosinus*. But in the worship of other Deities, they played upon Cymbals for the sake of mirth; as appears by *Athenæus*'s description of the *Parilia*, or *Feasts in honour of the Goddess* Pales, *Lib.* 8. *p.* 361. ἠχήκεσαν ἐγένετο, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν αὐλῶν βόμβος, καὶ κυμβάλων ἦχος, ἔτι τε τυμπάνων κτύπος μετὰ ᾠδῆς ἅμα γινόμενος: *There was heard through all the City, the noise of Pipes, and the sound of Cymbals, and the beating of Drums, and singing.* So *Herodian*, Lib. 5. speaking of *Heliogabalus*, cap. 5. 19. Περὶ τὸ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐχόρευεν ὑπὸ παντοδάπης ἤχους ὀργάνων· γυναῖά τε ἐπιχώρια ἐχόρευον αὐτῷ περιθέουσαι τοῖς βωμοῖς κύμβαλα ἢ τύμπανα καὶ χεῖρας φέρουσαι: *He danced about the Altars, with the sound of all sorts of Instruments; and the women of the Country danced with him, running round the Altars, and carrying Cymbals or Tabers in their hands.* That there were Cymbals also used in private Meetings for dancing and mirth, I have already shewn, and could easily prove more at large. It is known also that they were used in War, but it was only among the *Arabians*. And so saith *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Stromat. 2: p. 164. χρῶνται δὲ καὶ τοὺς πολέμους αὐτῶν—κτυπήσει τυμπάνου, καὶ Ἀραβίοις κυμβάλου: *The Egyptians in their Wars use Drums or Tabers, and the Arabians, Cymbals.*

VII. Because I have said so much about the Cymbal, I shall add something about its Original, tho it contribute nothing to the illustration of St. *Paul*'s meaning in this place. It sufficiently appears by the places already alledged, that it was neither a *Roman* nor a *Greek* Instrument, but an *Asian*: because it was principally in use among the *Phrygians* and *Phenicians*, as we have seen out of *Herodotus*; and the *Arabians*, as we have been told by *Clemens*. And hence saith *Apuleius*, in Lib. de *Deo Socratis*: *Gaudent Ægyptia numina ferme plangoribus, Græca plerumque choreis, barbara autem strepitu cymbalistarum, & tympanistarum & choraularum: The Egyptian Deities are pleased generally with Beatings, the Greek for themost part with Dances, and the Barbarian with the noise of men playing upon Cymbals, or Tabers, or Pipes.*

Chapter XIV.

It was very common among the *Jews*, in whose Language it is called צלצל *tsiltsel*, from a Root which signifies to *ring* or *tinkle*, both among them and the *Arabians*. The word צלצל *tsiltsel* is constantly rendered by the *Septuagint* κύμβαλα, except in one or two places, which are perhaps corrupt. Possibly it signified also *Sistrum*, *a Timbrel*, as I shall have occasion hereafter to observe on *Psal.* cl. It is certain both these Instruments might by an *Onomatopœa* be so called.

I have been larger than I usually am, in treating of the Cymbal, partly because Dr. *Hammond* did not know what it was, and partly because two other great Men were as ignorant in this matter as he: One is *H. Grotius*, who tells us, that *for the most part* this Instrument *was made of Silver*, which by what I have said already, appears to be false; and for further proof take this passage out of *Josephus*, in *Lib.* 7. *cap.* 10. *p.* 243. where among the rest of *David's* musical Instruments, he reckons κύμβαλα, and describes them thus; ἦν πλάτια καὶ μεγάλα χάλκεα, *they were broad, great, and brasen.* The other is *S. Bochart*, who in his *Phaleg.* Lib. 4. c. 2. affirms, that the Cymbal differed hardly in any thing but the roundness of its form from the *Timbrel*, whereas the Timbrel was an Instrument with holes in it, and made with little cross bars of Metal, not like a pewter Saucer as the Cymbal. Which it is not proper in this place to prove at large.

Vers. 4. *Note* c. See my Note on the word χρηστὸς, in *Mat.* xi. 30.

CHAP. XIV.

Vers. 2. Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ.] What is said in this Verse, seems to be by way of concession, and therefore should be paraphrased thus: "For granting that he who speaks "in an unknown Language, does really use a Gift which he has re- "ceived from God; yet he should remember that he can speak in "that Language only to God, not to men who do not understand "it, and to whom all that he says is unintelligible. It was certainly a piece of folly and arrogance, not to say any worse of it, to speak so as to be understood by no body; for it was a mere ostentation of the Gift of Tongues. But there are some things to be observed with relation to that Gift, which our Author has past by, and will it may be give light to this whole Business.

I. They who received the Gift of Tongues, were doubtless instructed with them, in order to propagate the Gospel among those Nations whose Languages they were; whether they went into their Coun-

Countries, or discourſed with ſuch as came out of them: and therefore the time for uſing them was only when they could not be better understood in any other Language. Thoſe that were at that time at *Corinth*, and could ſpeak Greek, ought to uſe the Greek Tongue among the *Corinthians*, and not ſtrange Dialects which they could not underſtand, and for which they might be ſuſpected of Impoſture, becauſe no body underſtood them. For certainly one who could ſpeak Greek, and induſtriouſly uſed another Language among *Grecians* who underſtood nothing but their native Dialect, might not without reaſon be taken for a Deluder or Impoſtor. Chapter XIV.

II. But beſides *Grecians*, and thoſe who underſtood Greek, there were at *Corinth* ſome other People out of *Africa*, *Aſia*, and *Europe*, who reſorted thither for the ſake of Trade, and were unskilful in the Greek Language, and who having been converted by the Apoſtle to the Chriſtian Faith, had alſo received the Gift of Tongues, to enable them when they went into their own Country to preach the Goſpel among barbarous Nations. And theſe ſeem to be the firſt who might abuſe the Gift of Tongues in the Church of *Corinth*; as if for inſtance, a man that could ſpeak Latin, becauſe born and bred in *Italy*, had uſed the *Illyrian*, *Celtick* or *Spaniſh* Language, the knowledg of which had been conferred upon him by God, when no body was preſent that underſtood any of thoſe Tongues.

III. It muſt be acknowledged notwithſtanding, that a Grecian, before Grecians, might, for example, ſpeak *Spaniſh*, that thoſe of his own Country might know he was inſtructed by God with the knowledg of the *Spaniſh* Tongue; to which purpoſe there was need of an Interpreter, who by a faithful interpretation of what he ſaid, might ſhew that he did not ſpeak ſome fictitious Language, or uſe ſounds that had no ſenſe belonging to them, but the true *Spaniſh* Language. For if he himſelf had firſt uſed a ſtrange Language, and then ſpoken in Greek what he had ſaid before in an unknown Tongue, he might be ſuſpected by thoſe who did not underſtand that ſtrange Language. But if no body were preſent, who could perform the Office of an Interpreter? It was better for the Perſon ſo miraculouſly endued with the knowledg of the *Spaniſh* Language to hold his peace, leſt he ſhould ſpeak to thoſe who did not underſtand it, to no purpoſe, or become ſuſpected to the Hearers, if he himſelf ſhould take upon him to be his own Interpreter, or at leaſt by his proud oſtentation of an uſeleſs accompliſhment, at that inſtant of time, offend them.

IV. Theſe two ſorts of men St. *Paul* here reproves, who uſed the Gift of Tongues in an improper place and time, and prefers ſuch Pro-

Chapter XIV.

phets as ſpake nothing but Greek to them. But you will ſay, Were not thoſe who preached the Goſpel in ſtrange Languages, alſo Prophets? Yes, undoubtedly; but not to thoſe who did not underſtand thoſe Languages, and therefore the Apoſtle diſtinguiſhes them from thoſe who ſpake only Greek. And he juſtly prefers a Grecian, endued only with the Gift of Prophecy, and ſpeaking to his Countrymen in their own Language, to one who did not uſe the Gift of Prophecy, but of Tongues, among thoſe who did not underſtand them. Theſe things being diligently obſerved, which, if I am not miſtaken, are true, or very probable, the Apoſtle's whole diſcourſe will be perſpicuous, which is otherwiſe very dark and intricate.

Ibid. Πνεύματι δ λαλεῖ.] I do not think this is to be underſtood of a particular Inſpiration, for they who had once received the Gift of Tongues, were not inſpired as often as there was occaſion to uſe them; but they expreſſed their minds whenever they pleaſed, in any of thoſe Languages with which the Spirit of God had inſtructed them. So that by πνεύματι here is meant *to his own underſtanding*, but not to another's.

Verſ. 5. Ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ.] That is, not as our Author ſays, *unleſs he afterwards ſpeak in a known Language, what he had expreſſed in an unknown*; for it would have been abſurd to ſpeak, for inſtance, in *Spaniſh* to *Grecians*, that which one ſhould be forced afterwards to ſpeak ones ſelf in Greek; but, "he is a greater Prophet who propheſies in one "known Language, than he that propheſies in many unknown, if he "cannot deliver his mind without them in a known Tongue. A *Carthaginian*, for example, who beſides the *Punick*, ſhould have underſtood all the Dialects of the *Mores* and *Lybians*, could not be ſo much eſteemed at *Corinth*, as a *Greek* Prophet that underſtood only his *native* Language, unleſs he were able alſo to expreſs in *Greek* what he could ſay in the Language of the *Mores* or *Libyans*. This St. *Paul* calls here ἰδιωτεύειν, becauſe he is ſpeaking of a man who did not underſtand Greek, and wanted an Interpreter among the Grecians, and ſo would have been his own, if he had underſtood that Language. No other Perſon can be intended, for who doubts but a native Grecian was able to ſpeak in his *own* Tongue what he ſaid in a ſtrange one? *Grotius* would have the Gift of Interpretation to be underſtood of *a faithful Memory*, but that is manifeſtly a harſh and far-fetch'd Interpretation.

Verſ. 10. Τοσαῦτα γένη φωνῶν.] I wonder Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphraſe ſhould repreſent St. *Paul* as uſing that Fiction of ſome of the Antients about *ſeventy Languages*; which has been confuted by *S. Bochart*

chart in his *Phaleg.* Lib. 1. c. 15. to whom I refer the Reader. Chapter XIV.

Verſ. 13. Περσεύχετα ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ.] Of one that could ſpeak Greek this cannot, as I have ſaid, be underſtood; for what need had any man of a miraculous Gift, to enable him to expreſs that in his Mother Tongue, which he himſelf ſpake in a ſtrange Language, if he did but underſtand what he ſaid? And every one that uſes a Language, the knowledg of which he has received from God, is ſuppoſed to underſtand what he himſelf ſays; for he would *really* be *a ſounding Braſs*, or *a Cymbal making a confuſed noiſe*, who ſhould ſpeak words in a ſtrange Dialect, which yet he did not know the meaning of. *Grotius* interprets theſe words thus: *Let him pray that he may faithfully retain in his memory what he ſpeaks outwardly with his Tongue, that ſo he may deliver the ſame things in Greek.* But, *firſt*, this Interpretation does not agree with the ſenſe of the word διερμηνεύειν, which ſignifies *to interpret*, not *to remember*. *Secondly*, He ſuppoſes that thoſe who uſed ſtrange Languages, ſpake from Inſpiration, not their own thoughts, but what was ſuggeſted to them by the Spirit; which we have no certain ground to believe, nor is it probable it was ſo, at that time particularly, and in that place: For if this ſuppoſition of *Grotius* were true, the Holy Ghoſt would have inſpired a *Corinthian* to ſpeak, for example, in the *Punick* Language, in ſuch time and place as he would leaſt of all have ſtood in need of that Tongue, there being no *Carthaginian* preſent. But to what end I pray? Was it that he might hold his peace in the Church; in which certainly it would have been very improper to ſpeak in the *Punick* Dialect, if there was no body there that underſtood it? Or was it that he might keep his skill in that Language till a fitter occaſion? But he had better have been inſpired with the knowledg of the *Punick* Tongue, when there was need of that Inſpiration, leſt his memory ſhould not retain it, or there ſhould be occaſion for a new Miracle to confirm his memory. For if (which I obſerve in the *third* place in oppoſition to *Grotius*'s Interpretation) he could not have interpreted by his memory in Greek, what he had ſaid by heart and *extempore* in the *Punick* Language, without a Miracle, much leſs could he have performed that ſome time after. And the Interpretation which Dr. *Hammond* gives of theſe words in his Paraphraſe, is altogether as inſignificant, unleſs we underſtand the Apoſtle to ſpeak of a Stranger that could not ſpeak Greek.

Verſ. 14. Ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστι.] I have ſet down this whole Verſe in Greek, that the Reader may compare it with our Author's Paraphraſe, in which he ſpeaks ſo barbarouſly and improperly, that he rather obſcures the ſenſe of

Chapter XIV.

the Apoſtle, which is dark in it ſelf, than explains it. What mortal would have interpreted τὸ πνεῦμά μου *by my Gift*, or *the Gift of Tongues which is given me?* and what intolerable Language is it to ſay *my Gift prays?* and ſo of the reſt. This is *lapides loqui*, as one ſaid, not *verba humana*, to break a Man's teeth with hard words. *Grotius* much more fitly interprets τὸ πνεῦμα of *a motion from Inſpiration*, and explains the laſt words by this Paraphraſe: *Mens mea nihil bene excogitatum profert*; *My own mind produces no good thoughts.* But this is nothing to the purpoſe, for who had not rather hear an inſpired diſcourſe, if he can but underſtand it, than one that is merely the product of a man's own meditation? Some other Interpretation therefore muſt be given of this place; and St. *Paul*'s mind, if I am not miſtaken, expreſſed thus: "If I make uſe of an unknown Tongue, I pray indeed my ſelf with "my *mind*, becauſe I underſtand what my words ſignify; but the "*ſenſe* of what I ſay is of no uſe to others who do not know it; and "if they join with me in that Prayer, pray rather with their *bodies* "than with their *minds*.

Firſt, The Phraſe τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχομαι ſignifies, *I pray with my mind*; and is tacitly oppoſed to the action of the Hearers who were then preſent, and prayed rather with their *bodies* than their *minds*, becauſe they did not underſtand what he that made uſe of a ſtrange Language ſaid. Nothing is more ordinary than for the *Spirit* and the *Body* to be oppoſed to one another; which in the uſe of the Sacred Writers are ſuch perpetual *correlates*, as the Logicians ſpeak, that upon the mention of one, the other is preſently thought on. See *Rom.* viii. 23. and *Gal.* v. 16.

Secondly, The phraſe ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου, *my mind* or *underſtanding* ſignifies the *ſenſe* or *meaning* of what I ſay; which is ἄκαρπος, *without Fruit*; *viz.* to others who do not underſtand it. So this word νοῦς is frequently uſed, and among other places in the Book of *Wiſdom*, Chap. ii. 16. Theſe things being ſuppoſed, the ſenſe alſo of the following words is evident, which will otherwiſe be very obſcure.

Verſ. 15. Προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεῖ.] That is, I will pray ſo, as at the ſame time to pray to God with my mind, and that the ſenſe of what I ſay may be underſtood by the ſtanders by. I confeſs an Attick Writer, or one that had ſtudied to expreſs himſelf neatly and elegantly, would never have ſaid προσεύξεσθαι νοΐ, for ὥστε προσεύξεσθαι ἅμα προσόντας τὸν τῶν προσευχῶν νοῦν ἀκούειν, *to pray ſo as that thoſe who are preſent may underſtand the meaning of my Prayer.* But St. *Paul* was never curious in his ſtile, and he ſaid *to pray with my mind*, tho in a different ſenſe, becauſe he had ſaid before *to pray with the Spirit.* But he certainly

tainly meant what I have ſaid, or ſomething like it, as appears by what follows: See *verſ.* 19. *Grotius* interprets this Verſe thus: *Optandum eſt, ut orem, id eſt, ut oret aliquis non tantum motu illo afflatitio, verum etiam iis quæ ipſe excogitavit; It were to be wiſhed that I prayed, that is, that a Man prayed not only from that Divine impulſe, but alſo out of his own Thoughts.* But I ſay it were to be wiſhed rather that all who pray in publick, prayed by Inſpiration or a Divine Impulſe, but in a known Language. St. *Paul* in this Diſcourſe does not oppoſe that which a Man *deviſes* himſelf, and ſpeaks in a known Tongue, to a Prayer that is *inſpired*, but is expreſſed in a *ſtrange* Language; but only a Prayer which cannot be underſtood, to one that may. They who had the Gift of Tongues might as well expreſs their own Thoughts in a ſtrange Dialect, as that which was revealed to them by Inſpiration. This our Author in ſome meaſure perceived, and therefore mollified a little *Grotius*'s Interpretation. Chapter XIV.

Verſ. 16. *Note* a. I rather think the Apoſtle means here other acts of Thankſgiving, which particular Perſons, according as it ſeemed good to them, offer'd up to God in the Church, in ſtrange Languages, to which they who did not underſtand thoſe Languages, could not ſay *Amen*. For who will believe that there was any Governor of a Church ſo ſenſleſs, as when he celebrated the *Euchariſt*, a religious Ceremony in which all the Members of the Church were to join, to uſe an unknown Language? This is confirmed by the Pronoun σῇ *thy*, which ſhews the Apoſtle to ſpeak of Thankſgivings offer'd up in the name of *one* Man, and not of the *whole* Church.

Verſ. 19. Διὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου λαλῆσαι.] Tho διὰ φωνῆς in this place as well as ἐν νοΐ *verſ.* 15. ſeems to be but a harſh Phraſe, to ſignify, *that I may be underſtood*; yet that *that* is the meaning of it, may appear by the following words, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, *that I might teach others alſo*; as alſo by its being oppoſed to λόγων ἐν γλώσσῃ *words in an unknown Tongue*. *Grotius* interprets this alſo *a me ipſo cogitata, The product of my own Thoughts*; as if one that had been endued with the Gift of Tongues, could not have expreſſed the product of his own private Thoughts in an unknown Language! Or as if he that ſo unſeaſonably made oſtentation of that Gift, ſpake by Inſpiration!

Verſ. 21. Ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων λαλήσω.] Dr. *Hammond* follows indeed for the moſt part *Grotius*, and not without reaſon, as being unqueſtionably the beſt of all the Interpreters of Scripture. But here he juſtly forſakes him, becauſe that great Man puts ſuch an Interpretation upon this Paſſage alledged out of *Iſaiah*, as makes it to be nothing to the purpoſe. Beſides, there are other things in his Annotation

Chapter XV.

tion on this place liable to reprehenſion: As when he ſaith; *Hæc citari à Paulo, ex loco quidem Eſaiæ* XXviii. 11, 12. *non tamen ex verſione* LXX *Intt. ſed ex verſione Aquilæ docet nos Origenes Philocaliæ* viii. For, firſt, *Origen* ſpeaks of this paſſage, not in the viiith, but ixth Chapter of his *Philocalia*. Secondly, he does not ſay that St. *Paul* had cited *Iſaiah* according to the Verſion of *Aquila*, whom he very well knew to have lived but in the time of the Emperor *Adrian*. All that he ſays is this, after he had ſet down this place of St. *Paul*, wherein he alledges *Iſaiah*'s words: Εὕρον γὰρ τὸ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα τῇ λέξει ταύτῃ ἐν τῇ τῶ Ἀκύλα ἑρμηνείᾳ κείμενα: *for I have found what is equivalent to this expreſſion in the interpretation of* Aquila. St. *Paul*, who underſtood the Hebrew Language, cited theſe words out of the Hebrew Copy, not out of the Verſion of *Aquila*, which was compoſed a great many Years after the Apoſtle's death. If *Aquila* tranſlated them in the ſame manner, the reaſon of that was, becauſe he alſo carefully follow'd the Hebrew. This was an error in *Grotius*, which proceeded not from careleſneſs or oſcitancy, and much leſs from ignorance, but from an unavoidable weakneſs in human Nature, which will not bear a perpetual Intention of Mind. For I do not doubt but this difficult Chapter kept that great Man's Thoughts a long while employed; and ſo writing this after he was tired with too long Study, he fell into a double Miſtake, which I do not ſpeak to upbraid him, far from that, but only to caution the Reader.

CHAP. XV.

Verſ. 8. *Note* b. WHAT is obſerved by *Baronius* out of *Suetonius*, and here ſince him by Dr. *Hammond*, is vain, being grounded upon a corrupt reading of the words of *Suetonius*, where inſtead of *Abortivos*, the beſt Copies have *orcinos* or *orcivos*, which *Iſ. Caſaubon* and *Læv. Torrentius* have ſhewn to be the true reading. The phraſe uſed here by St. *Paul*, is much older than *Auguſtus*; for the Hebrews metaphorically call any mean or contemptible thing נֵפֶל, and that word the *Septuagint* very truly render by ἔκτρωμα in *Job* iii. 16. and *Eccleſ.* vi. 3. So any thing whatſoever that is in its kind little, might be called *abortive*, as *Antonius*'s Dwarf in *Horace*, Sat. 3. Verſ. 46.

Appellat —— pater —— pullum male parvus
Si cui filius eſt, ut abortivus fuit olim
Siſyphus.

On which place ſee the old Interpreter.

Verſ.

Verſ. 19. Εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἠλπικότες ἐν Χριστῷ μόνον, ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν.] Two things St. *Paul* proves in this Diſcourſe: 1. That the Apoſtles did not falſly pretend themſelves to expect a Happineſs after this Life from Chriſt, but truly expected it; becauſe otherwiſe they would never have underwent ſo many Hardſhips and Dangers for his ſake. 2. That this their expectation was not vain, becauſe it was grounded upon the Reſurrection of Chriſt, whereof they were witneſſes, and therefore credible, becauſe they ſuffer'd ſo much for being ſo, and it was a thing in which they could not be deceived. This arguing has a great deal more ſtrength and certainty in it, than that of *Cicero* in a like matter, and grounded in part upon the ſame Topicks, *Acad. Quæſt.* iv. where ſaith *Lucullus: Ille vir bonus, qui ſtatuit omnem cruciatum perferre, intolerabili dolore lacerari potius, quam aut officium prodat aut fidem; cur has ſibi tam graves leges impoſuit, cum quamobrem ita oporteret nihil haberet comprehenſi, percepti, conſtituti? Nullo igitur modo fieri poteſt, ut quiſquam tanti æſtimet æquitatem & fidem, ut ejus conſervandæ cauſâ nullum ſupplicium recuſet, niſi iis rebus adſenſus ſit, quæ falſæ eſſe non poſſunt. That good Man who reſolves to undergo all manner of Torments, and to be torn in pieces with unſufferable pain, rather than to betray his Duty or Truſt; why has he impoſed upon himſelf ſuch ſevere Laws if he did not ſee ſufficient reaſon for him to do ſo? It is utterly impoſſible that any Man ſhould put ſuch a value upon Juſtice and Honeſty, as to ſubmit to any Tortures rather than act contrary to them, unleſs he have aſſented to ſuch things as cannot be falſe.* And Tuſcul. Lib. 1. *Cicero* himſelf ſpeaks thus: *Neſcio quomodo inhæret mentibus quaſi ſæculorum quoddam augurium futurorum, idque in maximis ingeniis, altiſſimiſque animis & exſtitit maxime & apparet facillime; quo quidem demto, quis tam eſſet amens, qui ſemper in laboribus & periculis viveret? I know not how, there abides in the Minds of Men as it were a preſage of a future State, and eſpecially in Perſons of the greateſt Capacity and deepeſt Thoughts, in whom it moſt eaſily diſcovers it ſelf; and if this apprehenſion was taken away, who would be ſo mad as to live perpetually in Troubles and Dangers?* This indeed ſhews that thoſe Heathens believed another Life after this, but does not prove that they were not miſtaken. For it was poſſible they might be deceived by an Opinion taken up in their Childhood, for which they could produce no ſufficient Arguments. But the caſe of the Apoſtles was quite otherwiſe, who proved the reality of a future State by the Authority and Reſurrection of Chriſt; which they themſelves had ſeen, and confirmed the truth of by their Sufferings. Chapter XV.

Ibid. Ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων.] Who can neither live quietly nor die naturally, nor ſo much as find a Grave after Death. To this purpoſe is

Chapter XV. that Inſcription on the Monument of *Calliſtus*, if it be an antient one, in *Rom. Subterran.* Par. 1. p. 307. ALEXANDER *mortuus non eſt, ſed vivit ſuper aſtra, & corpus hoc tumulo quieſcit. Vitam explevit cum Antonino Imp. qui ubi multùm beneficii antevenire prævideret, pro gratia omnium, odium reddit. Genua enim flectens, vero Deo ſacrificaturus, ad ſupplicium ducitur. O tempora infauſta! quibus, inter ſacra & vota, ne in cavernis quidem ſalvari poſſimus. Quid miſerius vita? Sed quid miſerius morte, cum ab amicis & parentibus ſepeliri nequeant?*

Verſ. 29. *Note* c. I. That *Ellipſis*, which our Author would have to be in this Phraſe ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν for ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀναστῆναι τοὺς νεκρούς, in the ſeries of ſuch a Diſcourſe as St. *Paul*'s here is, and in the middle of a Diſputation which required that every thing intended ſhould be expreſſed, is very harſh, and has nothing common with thoſe examples which he alledges.

II. What he confidently aſſerts in the latter end of this Annotation, that the τινὲς ἐξ ὑμῶν *verſ.* 12. is the Nominative caſe to the Verb βαπτίζονται, is groundleſs and unneceſſary, βαπτίζονται having a Nominative caſe belonging to it in this very 29*th verſe*, viz. οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, which immediately goes before. But that intricate way of Writing which the *Doctor* had accuſtom'd himſelf to, made him able to digeſt what none beſides himſelf could do.

III. I confeſs the opinion of St. *Chryſoſtom* and others about this place, contains a very commodious ſenſe, if we conſider it in it ſelf, but compar'd with the Apoſtle's words it cannot ſtand. And to me their Interpretation ſeems to be moſt probable, who take ὑπὲρ here to be equivalent to ἀντὶ, and ſo the ſenſe to be this: "If there were no "Reſurrection, what would become of thoſe who every day, tho "they ſee Chriſtians put to Death for their Profeſſion, do yet chear-"fully receive Baptiſm, that they may ſupply the place of thoſe that "are dead in the Chriſtian Church? By the ſame way of arguing we might prove, that bearing of Arms is not without a reward annexed to it: If thoſe that bore Arms were to have no reward for ſo doing, when ſo many Soldiers are continually killed, what ſhould they do who are liſted in the room of thoſe that are dead, and ſupply their place? That ὑπὲρ is frequently uſed for ἀντὶ no one can doubt. Yet I ſhall add a Paſſage out of *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſ.* in which he ſpeaks of Soldiers ſubſtituted in the room of others that are killed, whereby not only that appears, but St. *Paul*'s words may be very much illuſtrated. And it is in his *Antiq. Rom.* Lib. 8. p. 553. ΤΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΘΑΝΟΝΤΩΝ, ſaith he, ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ανπάτιας πολέμῳ στρατιωτῶν ἄξιον ἑτέρους καταγράφειν: FOR *thoſe that* DIED *in the War with the Antiatians, they determined to levy other Soldiers.*

IV. What

IV. What our Author relates out of *Photius* concerning *Syneſius*, is in *Cod.* 26. But there was a great difference between *Syneſius* and thoſe againſt whom St. *Paul* diſputes: For he being a *Platonick*, believed the Immortality of the Soul, and the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life; but theſe *Corinthians*, together with the Reſurrection of the Body, denied the Soul's Immortality, and a future Judgment, and were perhaps *Jews*, who of *Sadduces* had embraced the Chriſtian Religion. Now St. *Paul*, in order to prove the Reſurrection, proves that there were rewards to be expected after this Life; which reaſoning could not be deſigned againſt the *Platoniſts*, becauſe they confeſſed a future Happineſs, tho they did not believe the Reſurrection of the Dead. And Religion might well enough conſiſt with the opinion of the *Platonicks*, tho the *Sadduces* who diſowned the Immortality of the Soul utterly overthrew it. And therefore the *Egyptians* bore with *Syneſius*, notwithſtanding he was a *Platonick*, which they would never have done if he had been a *Sadduce*. Chapter XV.

Verſ. 33. φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί.] There are ſome who from this place, and the citation out of *Aratus*, infer that St. *Paul* was converſant in the Writings of the Heathen Poets: But without ſufficient ground, becauſe ſuch as theſe were common proverbial forms of Speech uſed by every one, and might be eaſily learned from ordinary Diſcourſe, even of ignorant Perſons, by which means I am apt to think the Apoſtle came to the knowledg of them. For the *Jews* did not uſe to read much the Writings of the Heathens; nor does the ſtile of St. *Paul* otherwiſe give us the leaſt reaſon to imagin that he ever ſo much as attempted any thing in that ſort of Study. For if he had been at all converſant in Heathen Authors, we ſhould doubtleſs have ſeen more effects of it in his way of Writing. However we may learn from hence, that Chriſtians ought not to reject any thing which was well ſaid by the Heathens: And therefore I think it not amiſs to produce two more Paſſages, beſides thoſe which have been alledged by *Grotius*, out of Heathen Writers to this purpoſe. Æſchylus ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας:

Ἐν πάντι πρᾶγμ' δ' ἐσθ' ὁμιλία κακὴ
Κάκιον ἐστὶν, ἢ πρέπει θ' ὁ χαμψίθρ.
Ἄτης ἄρουρα δύναται ἐκκαρπίζεται.

That is, according to the interpretation of *Grotius*:

Adeo malorum, ſcilicet, commercio
Nil pejus uſquam eſt; oritur infelix ſeges,
Nam ſceleris arvum nil niſi mortem parit.

Epictetus in *Enchirid.* cap. xlv. Ἐὰν ὁ ἑταῖρός σου μιαίνηται, καὶ τὸ συγκατατεθέμενον αὐτῷ μολύνεσθαι ἀνάγκη, κἂν αὐτὸς ᾖ τὸ χρῶμα καθαρός: *If a Companion be corrupted, he that converſes with him muſt needs alſo be corrupted, tho perhaps he were* [before] *pure.*

Ibid. *Note* e. I take χρηστὰ ἤθη here in the ſenſe in which it is commonly underſtood, becauſe thoſe who denied the Reſurrection were undoubtedly Perſons of *evil Manners*; and that this was St. *Paul*'s meaning, appears by the following words; *Awake to Righteouſneſs, and ſin not.* So in *Ariſtophanes in Nub.* p. 177. *Ed. majoris*, Act. 3. Sc. 2. the Chorus addreſſing themſelves to *juſt Reaſon*, ſay:

Ἀλλ' ὦ πολλοῖς τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἤθεσι χρηστοῖς στεφανώσας
Ῥῆξον φωνὴν ἣ τυγχάνεις, καὶ τίνα σαυτῆς φύσιν ἔχεις.

But O thou who haſt crowned our Anceſtors with abundance of good Manners, ſpeak and declare thy Nature. Where unqueſtionably χρηστὰ ἤθη ſignifies *good Manners*, as in many other places: Yet Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation and this may be joined together.

Verſ. 54. *Note* g. This remark our Author took out of *H. Grotius*; but tho the Hebrew לנצח ſignify *for ever*, and Death be to be finally aboliſhed after the Reſurrection, yet St. *Paul* does not refer to that here: for if he had, he would have rendred the words of *Iſaiah*, *Chap.* xxv. 8. by εἰς αἰῶνα, which he now interprets εἰς νῖκος, becauſe he had before reckoned Death in the number of *Chriſt*'s Enemies, *verſ.* 25, and 26. and afterwards in *verſ.* 57. he ſaith that God had given us τὸ νῖκος *the victory* over Death. So that of two ſignifications, whereof the Phraſe לנצח *Inetſahh* is capable, viz. *for ever*, and *in victory*, St. *Paul* here follows the latter, which made moſt for his purpoſe: And indeed that ſignification agrees beſt to the place in *Iſaiah* it ſelf.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 19. *Note* c. I. I Wonder our learned Author ſhould begin this Annotation with ſaying that Ἐκκλησία *the Church did not* ONLY *ſignify the place of aſſembling together, but alſo the Perſons that uſed to do ſo:* When it is certain the former ſignification of the word, for a *Place*, was wholly unknown in the times of the Apoſtles, in which Ἐκκλησία was always uſed for an *Aſſembly*, as well among the Chriſtians as by the Greeks.

II. I rather alſo underſtand ὁ οἶκος of the *Houſe it ſelf*; which is ſaid here to have had a *Church* in it, becauſe there were in it ſeveral Chriſtians, ſo that that Houſe ſeemed to contain a whole Church. *Tertullian* in Lib. *de Exhort. ad caſtit.* cap. vii. *Where there are three Perſons, there is a Church, tho they be Laicks.*

Verſ. 22. *Note* d. I. Thoſe *learned Men* who affirm there were only *two* degrees of Excommunication among the *Jews*, are *Selden* and his followers: See his Treatiſe *de Synedriis Judæorum*, Lib. 1. cap. 7. And I confeſs I could never meet with any that has anſwered his Arguments, tho Dr. *Hammond* does not doubt but he was miſtaken; but our Author was too great a favourer of Eccleſiaſtical Puniſhments, which yet it is certain have done more miſchief than good to the Chriſtian Church.

II. What he ſays about the word *Maran*, is taken out of *Grotius*, without Care or Examination. (1.) The *Etrurians* did not call their Kings *Marani*, but *Murrani*, as *Grotius* tells us out of *Servius* on *Æneid.* 12. *verſ.* 529. (2.) The *Syrians* are not ſtiled *Maronitæ* becauſe they call Chriſt *Lord*, but from one *Maron* an Abbot, whom the *Maronitæ* affirm to have been Orthodox, but others a Heretick; or from *Maronia* a Territory of *Syria:* on which matter there is extant a Diſſertation of *Gabriel Sionita* and *Joannes Hezzonita*, both *Maronites.* It is certain *Maron* is a *Syrian* name, there being in the *Recognit.* of S. *Clement*, Lib. 3. c. 2. mention made of *Maron* the *Tripolite* who entertained St. *Peter.* (3.) I cannot tell where *Epiphanius* ſays that God was called by the *Gazari*, *Marnas*; but I know that Mr. *Selden*, a great while before this was publiſhed by Dr. *Hammond*, or before ever *Grotius* firſt wrote it, had ſhewn that מרנשא *marnaſcha* was the name of a Deity among the *Gazæans*, in his Treatiſe *de Diis Syris*, Synt. 2. c. 1. (4.) *Stephanus* was miſtaken, when he ſaid that the *Cretians* called their Virgins Μάγνας, for they were called

Chapter XVI. called Μάρτυς, of which see *J. Selden*, and *C. Salmasius* on cap. 11. of *Solinus*.

III. The *Spaniards* do not say, *Anathema Maranatha*, but *Anathema Marano*, as it is rightly set down by *Grotius* out of *Mariana*, Lib. 7. cap. 6. *Rerum Hispanicarum*. The *Arabick* words subjoined to that form of speaking among the *Spaniards*, are not an interpretation of it, nor brought as such by *Grotius*, but of this place in St. *Paul*, out of the *Arabick* Translation, published by *T. Erpenius*.

IV. The conjecture set down by the *Doctor* concerning the passage in *Steph. Byzant.* on the word Λαοδίκεια, is taken from *Dan. Heinsius*, whose name he ought to have mentioned, tho it be but an unhappy conjecture. The Shepherd there spoken of, said in *Syriack* רם אנתּ *ram-anth*, thou art high, *viz.* O God. *Stephanus* misunderstood *Philo*, as *S. Bochart* well observes in *Chanaan*. Lib. 2. c. 12. to whom I refer the Reader.

Vers. 24. Ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.] The Pronoun μοῦ here is omitted in the *Alexandrian* Copy. But I have sometime suspected that the true reading was ΘΟΥ the same with Θεοῦ, which by a mistake came to be changed into ΜΟΥ.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Second Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Corinthians*.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 11. *Note* a. THIS Obſervation our Author had out of *Grotius*; but it is falſe, that the Hebrew מִפְּנֵי ever ſignifies *in reſpect of*: And if it did, the phraſe ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων would not ſignify *in reſpect of many*, viz. men, but *in many reſpects*; and the latter part of the Verſe ſhould be rendred thus: *That the Gift beſtowed upon us in many reſpects, might be received by many with thankſgiving for us.* To make ſenſe of which words, we ſhould be obliged to interpret *in many reſpects*, by *to many purpoſes* or *ends*; which yet will not agree either with the Hebrew or Greek phraſe. I believe therefore indeed that there is here a *Hebraiſm*, but ſo as that ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων is anſwerable to the Hebrew words מִפְּנֵי רַבִּים *mippbene rabbim*, *from the face of many*, that is, from many. It is certain מִפְּנֵי often ſignifies *from*, as *Chr. Noldius* in *Conc. Particularum* has obſerved. The Greek words are only tranſpoſed, and ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων put for ἐκ προσώπων πολλῶν, *from the faces of many*. And διὰ πολλῶν which follows, is put for διὰ πολλῶν δ' χαρισίων, as it is ſet at length in *Chap.* ix. 12. of this Epiſt. juſt as διὰ βραχέων ſignifies *in a few words*, in *Heb.* xiii. 22. So that this Verſe ought to have been rendred thus: *That many thanks may be given for us by many, for the Gift* beſtowed *upon us* by God.

Verſ. 13. Οὐ γὰρ ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε.] This is a *Paranomaſia*, or figure in which words of a like ſound and different ſenſe are joined together. Such another as that of *Dionyſius Cato*: *Nam legere & non intelligere, negligere eſt*; on which ſee *Joſ. Scaliger*. It is a noted ſaying of *Julian*; ἀνέγνων, ἔγνων, κατέγνων, *I have read, I have known, I have condemned.*

Verſ.

Chapter II.

Verſ. 22. Σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.] Thoſe who purchaſe any thing, for which they do not pay ready Mony, nor take it immediately away, uſe, for fear of its being changed, or a worſe commodity ſubſtituted in its room, to mark it with their Seal, and give the Seller earneſt. And this ſeems to be the ground of this metaphorical deſcription here, of thoſe benefits which God confers upon us, whilſt we live in this world, by the names of *Seal* and *Earneſt*. God has redeemed us with the Blood of his Son, and yet he does not preſently for ever make us his own, by beſtowing eternal Bleſſedneſs upon us, but leaves us in this mortal Life. But that the Primitive Chriſtians might not doubt whether God had really bought them, they were diſtinguiſhed, as it were, by God's Seal from the reſt of mankind, and received as an Earneſt from him the Spirit of Miracles. See *Epheſ.* i. 13. and iv. 30. Yet the thing from whence the Metaphor is taken, does not in every reſpect agree with that which is thus metaphorically deſcribed; nor is it neceſſary it ſhould, for it is ſufficient if there be but ſome ſimilitude between them.

CHAP. II.

Note b. THO, properly ſpeaking, the Apoſtle was the Author, both of the Puniſhment inflicted upon the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, and of his Cure upon repentance, yet ὑπὸ πλειόνων ought not therefore to be rendred *under many*, or *in the preſence of many*, contrary to the uſe of the Greek Language. St. *Paul* here joins others with himſelf, becauſe they had conſented to the puniſhment; which thereupon might be ſaid to have been inflicted *by them*, eſpecially conſidering it was denounced by their mediation.

Verſ. 11. Ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.] It may poſſibly, not without ſome colour of truth, be conjectured that by *Satan* in this place we are to underſtand a *man* who was an *enemy* to the *Corinthian* Church, rather than the *Devil*; which endeavoured to draw away him who had been delivered to Satan and others from its Communion. And therefore it follows; *for we are not ignorant of his devices:* Which words if they be underſtood of the Devil, ſeem to be flat and ſuperfluous; for who does not know that the Devil does all he can to pluck men out of the hands of Chriſt? Thus the word שטן *Satan* is uſed in 2 *Sam.* xix. 22. and *Mat.* xvi. 23. which word the Apoſtle ſeems to have paraphraſed in his *Epiſtle* to *Titus*, Ch. ii. 8. ἵνα ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας I cannot tell whether Dr. *Hammond* had not alſo ſome ſuch thoughts about this

this place, because he paraphrases it as if the Apostle had said; *for we are ignorant of his Devices.* Chapter III.

Vers. 16. Ὅς μὴ ὁσμὴ θανάτου, &c.] Namely, by *their* fault, whose folly and wickedness made them reject the Divine Mercy; and not without commendableness in those who received so great a favour as they ought to do. Such another ἔννοια came into the mind of *Cebes*, when he was composing that excellent little piece called his *Table*, wherein he represents the old Man that undertook to explain the design of it, speaking in this manner to the Spectators: Εἰ μὲν φρονεῖτε καὶ συνίετε τὰ λεγόμενα, φρόνιμοι καὶ εὐδαίμονες ἔσεσθε. εἰ δὲ μή, ἄφρονες καὶ κακοδαίμονες καὶ περὶ καὶ μαθεῖς γενόμενοι κακῶς βιώσεσθε. Ἔστι γὰρ ἡ ἐξήγησις ἑκάστῳ τῆς τοῦ Σφιγγὸς αἰνίγματος, ὃ ἐκείνη προὐβάλλετο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. εἰ μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ συνίη τις, ἐσώζετο· εἰ δὲ μὴ συνίη, ἀπώλλυτο ὑπὸ τῆς Σφιγγός: *If you mind and understand what is said, you will become wise and happy; but if not, you will be foolish and miserable, and wicked in your lives. For the explication* (of this Table) *is like the Riddle of* Sphinx, *which she propos'd to men; if any one understood it, he was saved; but if not, he was destroyed by the* Sphinx. This is the case of all those whose fate it is,

Virtutem ut videant, intabescantque relicta.

CHAP. III.

Vers. 1. *Note* a. THE Epistles commendatory usual among Christians, did not ow their Original to the *tesseræ hospitales* of the Heathens, but to an universal custom among all Nations of writing Letters of Recommendation in behalf of their Friends. And those publick Letters which were sent by the Bishops of one Church to another, were instituted especially upon the account of Heathens and Hereticks, for fear Idolaters, or Persons of erroneous Opinions in the Faith, should creep into the Churches, and make an ill use of their Liberality. See *Beveridge* on *Can. Apost.* 12. and 33.

Vers. 5. Οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοί ἐσμεν λογίσασθαί τι, ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν.] It is certain that all our Faculties, Encouragements and Helps to Faith and Piety, both General and Special, Natural and Evangelical, are entirely owing to God; and therefore all thanks and praise must be given for them to him alone: But these things St. *Paul* does not here speak of, but of those Thoughts and Gifts which were necessary to enable men, whether

Chapter III.

Jews or Gentiles, to preach the Goſpel. And it is certain that neither Jews nor Gentiles could any of them of their own heads have preached any thing like the Chriſtian Doctrin; but it was requiſite that thoſe firſt Preachers of the Goſpel ſhould receive the Evangelical Doctrin by Revelation from God and Chriſt, and be endued with neceſſary extraordinary Gifts, to communicate the knowledg of it to others, ſuch as the power of working Miracles, a ſingular conſtancy and unweariedneſs of mind, and incredible patience to undergo all manner of Afflictions, and the like. Both the foregoing and following Context clearly ſhew, that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks about a ſufficiency to preach the Goſpel, and nothing elſe; and therefore our Author ſhould have kept to that alone in his Paraphraſe.

Verſ. 6. Οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος.] I have already more than once obſerved, that by γράμμα is meant the Law, as it was underſtood by the Jewiſh Doctors, in a literal or grammatical ſenſe, and ſo propoſed by them to the obſervation of their Diſciples; and by πνεῦμα the *mind* of the Lawgiver, in giving the Law, that is, the Doctrin of the Goſpel, of which the Law contained only the στοιχεῖα *Elements*. And this St. *Paul* here ſeems to have a reference to, and tacitly to oppoſe his Apoſtolical Miniſtry to the Induſtry of thoſe Jews who travelled over Sea and Land to make Proſelites to the *Letter* of the Law. There is a manifeſt oppoſition put between the Law and the Goſpel in the 3*d* Verſe. See my *Note* on *Mat.* v. 17, and *Rom.* ii. 29.

Ibid. Τὸ μὲν γράμμα ἀποκτέινει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.] The mere obſervation of the *Letter* of the Law would not ſave any Man, or make him acceptable to God, unleſs he had alſo a regard to the *Spirit* or Intention of the Lawgiver, that is good Works, ſuch as are preſcribed in the Goſpel. But the *Spirit*, that is, the Goſpel, ſaves alone, without the obſervation of the Letter of the Law. This is the meaning here of St. *Paul*, and not what our Author ſays in his Paraphraſe, which has no manifeſt ground in Scripture, but relies purely upon Theological conjecture.

Verſ. 17. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν· οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐκεῖ ἐλευθερία.] That is, the Lord Jeſus, and his Goſpel, is the ſpiritual End of the Law, or the ultimate Scope to which the Lawgiver had a reſpect. And where that ſpiritual Intention of God or the Goſpel is known, there is Liberty; that is, men are no longer dealt with as Servants, who obey more out of fear than love. See my *Note* on *Rom.* viii. 15. There is nothing here that has any reference to *a Veil*, which is a token of ſubjection, as Dr. *Hammond* thought. The *Veil* which St.

St. *Paul* mentions belongs no more to that than the Veil of *Moſes*, which was not put upon thoſe that obeyed, but on him that commanded. Chapter IV.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. I Am apt to think that the word ὄστρακον properly ſignifies *teſta*, that is, *baked Clay*; and thence by a Metaphor was applied to Animals covered with a certain Shell, which for the hardneſs of it might be compared to ὄστρακον. Yet I affirm nothing poſitively; but this I affirm, that in this place ὀστράκινα σκεύη undoubtedly ſignifies *earthen Veſſels*; becauſe that is the perpetual ſignification of this Phraſe, and the other alledged by Dr. *Hammond* is without example. Beſides, the place it ſelf neceſſarily requires the word ὀστράκινον ſhould be ſo underſtood; for it is manifeſt that St. *Paul* compares the Apoſtles to frail and contemptible, and not precious or artificial Veſſels, ſuch as are made of the fineſt ſort of Shells. There is a clear oppoſition here put between the great Excellency of the Goſpel, and the meanneſs of its Preachers; or between the Power of God which exerted it ſelf in the Goſpel, and the Infirmity of the Apoſtles.

Verſ. 8. *Note* c. I fully agree with our learned Author in interpreting St. *Paul*'s words here, by the cuſtoms of the Heathens in their *Agones*. But there are ſome things to be obſerved on this Annotation.

I. It is ſtrange he ſhould confound the Verb ἀλγέω in Greek with the Latin *algeo*, when the Greek conſtantly ſignifies *to grieve*, *to be tormented*, and the Latin *to be cold*. Yet he has elſewhere committed the ſame miſtake, leſt any one ſhould think it was by mere accident. It is manifeſt that St. *Chryſoſtom* interprets the Verb θλίβεσθαι by the word ἀλγεῖν, and this latter does no more ſignify *to be cold* than the former, but *to be grieved* or *afflicted*.

II. In the place of St. *James*, λειπόμενοι is not an *Agoniſtical* term. The words of the Apoſtle are: *Let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, deficient in nothing*, τέλειοι καὶ ὁλόκληροι, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι: where the thing ſpoken of is manifeſtly a defect, and not any Victory which might be gained over the Chriſtians.

III. It would have been worth obſerving that the Prepoſition ἐξ in compoſition, carries a greater *emphaſis* with it than ἀπό; for which reaſon ἀπορεῖσθαι ſignifies only *to be perplexed*, but ἐξαπορεῖσθαι *to deſpair utterly*. So *Ariſtophanes* in Nubibus, Act. 4. Sc. 1. ἀπολεῖ με φησὶ κἀξολεῖν,

Chapter V. *be ſaith he will deſtroy and utterly ruin, or undo me.*

Verſ. 13. Τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τ πίστως.] That is, ſaith *Grotius*, *Habentes communem nobiſcum Dei Spiritum, qui non datur niſi credentibus. Iterum hic genitivus cauſam ſignificat; id eſt, conditionem requiſitam. Having the common Spirit of God with us, which is not given to any but Believers. Again here the Genitive Caſe ſignifies a Cauſe; that is, a neceſſary Condition.* But I ſhould rather interpret the *Spirit of Faith*, of a diſpoſition of Mind ſutable to what we believe, or to the Faith which we profeſs. So *the Spirit of Jealouſy*, and *the Spirit of Bondage*, &c. are the diſpoſitions of jealous Perſons, or Servants. Which Interpretation agrees better with what follows; for becauſe the Apoſtles were ſo diſpoſed, as Perſons who did not doubt of the truth or excellency of the Goſpel, ought to be, therefore they boldly preached it, and could not be deterred from ſo doing by any danger.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. Οἰκία τῦ σκήνους.] I don't think this is an *Hypallage*, whereby οἰκία τῦ σκήνους is put for σκῆνος τ οἰκίας, as *Beza* ſuppoſed, and therefore without neceſſity inverted the words in his Tranſlation. *But an Houſe of a Tabernacle* is a Hebraiſm, for a Houſe which, like a Tabernacle, is eaſily diſſolved, a Houſe that is built of Boards which may be eaſily taken aſunder; in oppoſition to a Houſe of Stone, which abides firm after its Tenant is removed. So that the *Genitive* σκήνους is equivalent to an Adjective, which would ſignify *like a Tabernacle*, ſuch as σκηνώδης, if it were in uſe, for then it might have been ſaid, ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος οἰκία σκηνώδης καταλυθῇ, *if our earthly Houſe, like a Tabernacle, were diſſolved.* Which the Greek not permitting, it is no wonder that St. *Paul*, after the manner of the Hebrews, ſupplied the place of an Adjective by a Subſtantive. *Hippocrates* in Aphoriſmis: ἀπολειφθέντος ἡ ψυχὴ τ τῦ σώματος σκήνους, *the Soul having left the Tabernacle of the Body.*

Verſ. 10. *Note* a. The *Vulgar Interpreter* read alſo τὰ ἴδια, as appears by his tranſlating it *propria*, and the ſenſe is not improper; but have a care of thinking that σῶμα ſignifies a Man himſelf. See what our Author has ſaid about that matter on *Rom.* vi. 6. and what I have there objected againſt him.

Verſ. 11. *Note* b. Tho πείθειν be often joined with a great opinion of the Perſon who perſwades; and he that deſires to perſwade, muſt above all things endeavour to get the approbation and good opinion of his Hearers; yet the uſe of the Greek Language will not permit that

that word to be taken in the ſenſe which our Author here fixes upon it. The Accuſative caſe to the Verb πίθειν is φύσω, which muſt be repeated from what goes before. The ſenſe is: *knowing how much the Judgment of God ought to be feared, we perſwade others to fear it, that we may induce them to a Holy Life; of which God is our witneſs, and you alſo, if am not miſtaken, conſcious.* Nor is it to be expected that the *Doctor* will any where elſe prove that πίθειν ſignifies any thing but to perſwade. It is common with him to impoſe ſignifications upon words, collected from mere uncertain reaſonings; whereas Uſe is that which ought to be principally regarded, and nothing elſe, when a word may be conveniently taken in its uſual ſenſe. Nothing is more dangerous than thoſe kind of reaſonings, which ought never to be recurred to, but when it is impoſſible to apply the ordinary ſignification of words to any particular places in which they occur. Chapter VI.

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. I Have already elſewhere ſaid, that out of *Judæa* the Chriſtians had no reaſon to fear the *Jews*, in thoſe times; and therefore the *day of Salvation* here cannot reaſonably be referred to the *Jews*, the Apoſtle writing to Perſons that lived in *Achaia*. But *Grotius* and others more fitly underſtand it of *eternal Salvation*. But I am not againſt thinking that the Apoſtle here oppoſes his own and the reſt of the Apoſtles Life, to the ill Manners and Effeminacy of falſe Teachers; provided the *2d verſe* be not interpreted of a Deliverance from them, by a ſudden deſtruction which was to befal them. For what deliverance could this be from Hereticks, when the Heathen Perſecutions daily encreaſed from this time, throughout all the *Roman* Empire?

Verſ. 14. *Note* b. Our learned Author, who finds fault with *Budæus* and *Stephanus* for taking up with a conjecture, rather than attending to the uſe of the word, ought to have produced a place in which the Verb ἑτεροζυγεῖν ſignified *to incline to one part more than another*; not a ſingle Paſſage out of *Phocylides*, where the Noun ἑτερόζυγος ſignifies an uneven balance. For if the ſignification of the Verb muſt neceſſarily be deduced from the Noun ἑτερόζυγος, by the ſame reaſon I will derive it from another ſignification of the ſame word, *viz.* for *of another kind*. In which ſenſe it is uſed by the *Septuagint* in *Levit.* xix. 19. where for, *thou ſhalt not let thy Cattel gender with a diverſe kind*, they read, τὰ κτήνη σου οὐ κατοχεύσεις ἑτεροζύγῳ. And ſo ἑτεροζυγεῖν ἀπίστοις will be, by joining themſelves to Unbelievers, to mix with another ſort of Men,

Chapter VII. Men, viz. different from Christians, or ἀπιστῖς ὅτι οἷον ἑτεροζυγοῦσι σφετερισμοῦ. St. *Paul* seems to have had a respect to that Law in *Levit.* It's certain at least that *Moses* by that Symbolical Law signified the same which the Apostle here forbids, as I have shewn in my Notes on that place. But why are Cattel of a different *Species* called ἑτεροζυγα? namely, because they do not use to be joined together in the same yoke ὑπ' ἰσὶ ζύγῳ. So saith *Hesychius*: ἑτεροζυγοι, οἱ μὴ συζυγοῦντες, *those that are not yoked together.* And on the other hand, γαμετὴ a Wife is by the same Grammarian called ὁμόζυγος, because she is linked together in the same Yoke with her Husband.

This Interpretation is more natural than that of the learned *M. Meibomius*, in Lib. *de Fabrica Triremium*, p. 37. where he renders this place; *do not strive with Unbelievers*, viz. like Rowers who endeavour by unequal force of rowing to pull the Vessel to one side. But what he says is worth our reading, tho it be much more simple and agreeable to the scope of the Apostle to interpret ἑτεροζυγεῖν σὺν τοῖς ἀπίστοις, to yoke themselves with Infidels, so as that ἑτερο-, which is in the composition of this Verb, be not opposed to the yoke of Unbelievers, but to the Yoke of Christ.

CHAP. VII.

Vers. 2. Ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.] That is, as it is rightly rendred by *Beza*, *quæstui habuimus*, *made gain* of them. Our Author's interpretation I have confuted on the place of the *Epistle* to the *Romans* referred to in his Paraphrase.

Vers. 8. *Note* a. Unless our Author had here look'd for Church Censures of all kinds, he would not have had one word to say upon this Chapter; but with all due respect to the Memory of so great a Man be it said, he had better have said nothing than wrested the Apostle's words at such a rate.

1. He should not have said indefinitely that the Greeks used the word ὥρη to signify a short space of time, but only the latter Greeks, as it is said by *Grotius*, from whom he took this remark, but should have better transcribed him. And the latter *Greeks*, as the same learned Man thinks, borrowed the word in that signification from the Latins. So it is taken in *Horace*, Sat. 1. Lib. 1.

——————— *Horæ*
Momento cita mors venit aut victoria læta.

II. The Verb λυπεῖν here does not signify to excommunicate, but to grieve by ſevere Reproofs, as I have already obſerved on 2 *Cor.* v. 2. And the *Corinthians* are ſaid to have been grieved for a ſhort time by St. *Paul*'s reproofs, becauſe they were ſenſible they had *deſerved* them; but when they had a little while after ſeen that they whom St. *Paul* had particularly aimed at in thoſe reproofs became ſober and penitent, they rejoiced that the ſeaſonable ſeverity of the Apoſtle had ſo good an effect upon them. St. *Paul* has no reference here to Excommunication, nor muſt *delivering to Satan* be confounded with Excommunication, a Puniſhment peculiar to the Apoſtles times, but afterwards unknown, as I have on 1 *Cor.* v. obſerved. Chapter VII.

III. It's true indeed there are others beſides the inceſtuous Perſon here referred to; but that they had the Cenſures of the Church inflicted upon them, is not ſaid by the Apoſtle, nor ſo much as intimated, but only that they were at firſt ſorry that there had been ſuch Diſorders committed among them, as gave St. *Paul* juſt reaſon to reprehend them; and afterwards rejoiced that they had been reclaimed by his reproofs from thoſe ſinful practices. There is no regard here had to Excommunication, inflicted either for a longer or a ſhorter ſpace of time.

Verſ. 9. Ελυπήθητε.] Our Author goes on in his Paraphraſe to interpret this word of *excommunication*, contrary to the Rules of Grammar: For who does not ſee that, *to ſorrow to Repentance*, is to be grieved ſo for what we have done amiſs, as to forbear offending for the future? Obſtinate Perſons are troubled indeed when their Sins are reproved, but they are not troubled becauſe they have ſinned, they are troubled only becauſe they are reproved. And therefore they are angry with thoſe who reprehend them, and never think of reforming their evil Practices. But Perſons of a yielding Temper are not ſorry that they are reprehended, but that they have ſinned, and therefore they take it well of thoſe who reprove them for their faults, and carefully abſtain from them ever after. And this Sorrow St. *Paul* here calls λύπην κατὰ θεόν.

Ibid. Ἵνα ἐν μηδενὶ ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν.] That is, ſo as not to think that you ſuffered any loſs of Reputation by my ſeverity in reproving you; quite otherwiſe than obſtinate Men would do, who would have cried out that they were injured and defamed, without ever becoming better.

Verſ. 10. Ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη, &c.] An excellent ſentence is here quite ſpoiled by our Author, and turned into an empty ſound of words, by his wreſting the words of the Apoſtle. Λύπη κατὰ θεὸν, ſaith he, is *the Diſcipline of the Church*, and λύπη κόσμου are *puniſhments inflicted by Men.*

Who-

Chapter VIII.

Who will endure such an Interpretation as this, so distant from the *literal* sense of the words, especially when a very good and excellent one arises from a Grammatical Explication of them? For the meaning of St. *Paul* is this, "That a Sorrow agreeable to the Divine Will, "such as is the Sorrow of all good Men, worketh Reformation of "Manners, and consequently Life; but the sorrow of worldly minded Persons makes them but sin the more, and that brings eternal "Death upon them, the just reward of obstinate and incorrigible "Offenders. For, as I have already said, good Men are sorry that they have sinned, bad Men that they are discovered and reproved; the former upon Reproof amend, but these latter grow but the more hardy (tho perhaps more close) in sinning.

CHAP. VIII.

Vers. 2. Ἁπλότητος.] That is, *of Liberality*, the original of which phrase I have set down on *Rom.* xii. 8.

Vers. 10. *Note* a. I cannot perswade my self that St. *Paul* would say, *ye have begun not only to do*, but also to will, in the same sense as he would have said, *ye have begun not only to will but also to do*; nor is there any example of such an inversion. So that I had rather, with Dr. *Hammond*, enquire for some other notion to fix here upon this word *Will*; and because it is common with us to do some things, especially in acts of Charity, with some kind of regret and not heartily, ἐκόντες ἀεκητί γε θυμῷ, as *Homer* speaks, interpret it of a chearful and liberal Mind, and so make the sense to be: Ye have not only from a Year ago begun to contribute a sum of Mony, but also as to your manner of doing it, it was not by compulsion, or the bare importunate perswasion of those whom you could not deny, but with a ready, chearful and charitable Mind: Without which qualification, the liberality which any Man exercises is ὑ θέλοντος *against his Will*, and becomes unacceptable, so that those who receive a Benefit from one who is not hearty in bestowing it, had almost rather not receive it at all, as esteeming more the *Will* of the giver than the Gift it self. And if it be so sometimes among Men, with God it is always so, who has ever a greater regard to the Disposition with which a Man gives, than what he gives. St. *Paul* therefore might aptly subjoin a word, which signified the affection of the Persons who gave, to a word which signified their Gifts themselves; and his Discourse does not descend, but ascend. *Seneca* has a great deal to this purpose in the beginning of his Lib. 2. *de Beneficiis*, and elsewhere in the same Book. This interpretation

terpretation is confirmed by the following *Verſ.* and the beginning of the ixth *Chapter.* Chapter IX.

Verſ. 19. Χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνοδινὸς ἡμῶν, &c.] This our Author muſt needs underſtand of a Synod and Biſhops, as if ſome Churches could not by Letters declarative of their Mind, have agreed about ſending a particular Perſon along with St. *Paul.* I ſhould rather have uſed general words, becauſe it in no wiſe appears that this matter was determin'd in a *Synod.* The ſame Perſon that is here intended, is afterwards, *verſ.* 23. called ἀπόστολος ἐκκλησιῶν, that is, one deputed by the Churches to accompany St. *Paul* in his Travels, and eaſe him of part of his work. Of this ſee the learned Mr. *Dodwell* in *Diſſert. Cyprian.* 6. S. 17.

Verſ. 23. Δόξα Χριστοῦ.] That is, *inſtruments,* ſaith *Grotius, of the glory of Chriſt*; viz. *in advancing the Goſpel,* ſaith our Author in his Paraphraſe. But I think it is much more natural to ſay, that thoſe are here called the *glory of Chriſt,* who are an honour to Chriſt by the integrity and ſanctity of their Life; as bad Chriſtians are a diſgrace and reproach to him. See what I have ſaid about a like expreſſion on 1 *Cor.* xi. 4.

CHAP. IX.

Verſ. 2. Παρεσκεύασται.] That is, that from a whole year paſt they had been forward to give, and begun already to contribute. Our Author here fancies ſome *new* act of liberality in the *Corinthians,* as if they had already *before* ſent a ſum of Mony to *Judæa,* which is no where intimated by St. *Paul.* This opinion of his proceeded from miſunderſtanding the 10th *verſe* of *Chap.* viii. on which ſee my Note. St. *Paul* had not told the *Macedonians,* that the *Corinthians* had a year ago got ready a ſum of Mony to ſend to *Judæa,* which he knew to be falſe; but that they had begun to contribute from that time, and were ſo forward and chearful in their Contributions, that the whole Sum expected from them would eaſily be completed. So that the word παρεσκεύασται here muſt be referred to a *readineſs of Mind.* To which it is very properly applied: *Gratiſſima* (ſaith *Seneca de Beneficiis* Lib. 2. c. 1.) *ſunt beneficia* PARATA, *facile occurrentia ubi nulla mora fuit, niſi in accipientis verecundia. Thoſe Benefits are moſt grateful which are* READILY *beſtowed, that come eaſily from a Man, and as it were of their own accord; and if there be any heſitation, it is on the part of the baſhful receiver.*

Chapter IX.

Verſ. 8. Δυνατὸς ὁ Θεὸς.] Our Author interprets what St. *Paul* here ſays that God was *able* to do, ſo as if he had ſaid he would certainly *do* it; and thence he infers that Riches are promiſed to the liberal, even under the *Goſpel*. But the promiſes of the Goſpel reſpecting all of them, the Soul and a future State, as appears both by the nature of the Evangelical Covenant, and innumerable places in the Goſpels, it is not neceſſary to repreſent St. *Paul* as ſaying here what he did not ſay. Nay he ſeems to have on ſet purpoſe ſpoken cautiouſly, when he ſaid δυνατὸς ὁ Θεὸς περισσεῦσαι, and not περισσεύσει *he will make to abound*; becauſe God does not promiſe, or give ſuch things under the Goſpel but for certain reaſons, which are many times unknown to us. And if he does not give them; we have no cauſe to complain, becauſe he has not promiſed them, and thoſe things which he gives us are infinitely more valuable. But does not the Apoſtle, you will ſay, pray to God that he would reward the bounty of the *Corinthians*, by beſtowing upon them greater Riches? I acknowledg he does, but it does not therefore follow that God has promiſed to make the bountiful always rich, but only that this is ſometimes done by him, and that it is lawful to pray for it, becauſe we may deſire Riches both for our ſelves and others, on this condition, that we make a good uſe of them. So that all that our learned Author ſays about Riches being promiſed under the Goſpel to the liberal, is inſignificant, and, to ſpeak the truth, more worthy of thoſe who affirm Riches to be a mark of the true Church, than of Dr. *Hammond*.

Verſ. 9. Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε, &c.] Theſe words only, which are alledged by St. *Paul*, ought to have been urged, and not others which he omits: For otherwiſe it is not the Apoſtle, but Dr. *Hammond* that here reaſons, who groundleſly infers from hence that Riches are promiſed in the New Teſtament. The place which he refers to in his Annotation on the foregoing Verſe, viz. *Mat.* xix. 29. does not prove that good Men ſhall be made rich in this World, or receive again their Kindred and Friends, and other things of the ſame nature, which they have forſaken for Chriſt; but only what will be ἑκατονταπλασίονα an *hundred-fold* better in the room of them, *viz.* a Mind contented with its preſent State, and the ſure hopes of eternal Happineſs. So that what our Author infers from the Paſſage alledged here out of the *Pſalms*, has no foundation, and cannot be attributed to St. *Paul*.

Verſ. 11. Ἐις παντὸς ἁπλότητα.] See before *Chap.* viii. 2. and my Note on *Rom.* xii. 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 4. *Note* b. I. I Do not at all doubt, but that St. *Paul* here ſpeaks, as *Grotius* before our Author had obſerved, of that Rod with which he had chaſtized *Elymas*, the inceſtuous Perſon, *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, and with which St. *Peter* had chaſtized *Ananias* and *Sapphira*; but I confeſs I cannot digeſt what Dr. *Hammond* here and elſewhere does, *viz.* the confounding of that miraculous Power of the Apoſtles with the ordinary Excommunication of Biſhops. He ought to have proved firſt, that that *delivering to Satan*, or any other ſuch Puniſhments inflicted by the Apoſtles, were the *arms* not only of the Apoſtles, but of all the Governors of the Chriſtian Church; which he neither ever did before his Death, nor, I believe, would ever do if he were to live again. This was a Seal which God ſet to the Apoſtles Doctrin, to fix the Chriſtian Church upon a laſting and immoveable Foundation; and all the reſt of the Miracles wrought in the Apoſtles time were deſigned to the ſame end: But that being once ſettled, no Man had ſuch a Power granted him, nor can any one be ſuppoſed to have had the like Authority.

II. However, it is well obſerved by the *Doctor*, that *carnal* here is all one with *weak*, which I ſhall confirm both by Reaſon and Examples. The *Fleſh* is very often oppoſed to the *Spirit*, that is, the Body to the Soul, in which compariſon the *Fleſh* is the moſt infirm and feeble; and hence the word *carnal* came to ſignify *weak*, as it is uſed in *Iſa.* xxxi. 3. where the Prophet thus beſpeaks the *Jews*, who put too much confidence in the *Egyptians*: *The Egyptians are Men and not God, and their Horſes* Fleſh *and not* Spirit; *the Lord ſhall turn his Hand, and he that helpeth ſhall fall, and he that is holpen ſhall fall down, and they ſhall all be conſumed together.* To this purpoſe alſo is that ſaying of Chriſt in *Mat.* xxvi. 41. *The Spirit indeed is willing, but the Fleſh is weak.*

III. Tho κατάκριμα ſignifies ſometimes *Excommunication* in the Writings of the Fathers, and ὀχύρωμα may very aptly be applied to a Mind full of Pride and Obſtinacy, and by thoſe Vices fortified againſt the Truth; yet it in no wiſe follows that κατάκριμα ὀχυρώματος ſignifies *the Excommunication of an obdurate Sinner.* What words do or may ſeparately ſignify, they do not always ſignify conjunctly, as every one knows, who is any thing of a Critick in this ſort of Learning. The reaſon is, becauſe one Phraſe can have but one metaphorical ſenſe belonging to it, and ὀχύρωμα being properly a *ſtrong Hold* or *Fence*, and here tranſlated to ſignify whatever Fleſh and Blood puts in the way of

Chapter X. the Gospel, to hinder the success and efficacy of it; it is necessary that καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρώματ☞ & καθαιρεῖν ὀχύρωμα should be rendred the *destruction of the Fence*, and to *destroy the Fence*, by a Metaphor taken from Military Affairs. So in *vers.* 5. λογισμὸς καθαιρεῖν is not *to excommunicate those that reason*, but *to overthrow reasonings*. Nor let any one say that *Fences are destroyed*, and *Reasonings overthrown* by Excommunication; for granting that, yet it will not follow that the Verb καθαιρεῖν and the Noun καθαίρεσις in these Phrases signify to *excommunicate* and *excommunication*.

IV. It is a pleasant mistake also in our Author, which his too great desirousness to find Excommunication every where spoken of in the Writings of the Apostles led him into, when he says that καθαίρεσις in *vers.* 8. signifies *Excommunication*, where St. *Paul* saith that he might boast of the Power which God had given him *for edification*, and not *for destruction*, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν. For who does not see that the opposite here to the *Edification* of the House of God, is not *excommunication* but *destruction?* One may as well say an *Edifice* is excommunicated, meaning that it is destroyed, as that an excommunicated Person is *edified*, to signify that his Sins are forgiven him. The same must be said of *Chap.* xiii. 10. where the same Phrase occurs.

V. Even in Ecclesiastical Writers, καθαίρεσις does not properly signify Excommunication, but only Abdication or degrading from Office, and is applied to Clergymen; nor is it always joined with Excommunication. See *Intt.* on the *Eleventh Apostolical Canon*.

Vers. 5. Λογισμὸς καθαιροῦντες.] Our Author intrudes again into this place the Censures of the Church without any distinction, whereas those Apostolical *Arms*, of which I before spake, are here intended. And indeed with whatever Arguments any Philosopher came armed, or what sublimity soever his Reasonings seemed to have in them; if he attempted to disturb the Church by Heretical Doctrins, and went to resist the Apostles, as if he had found them in an error; the Apostles could presently shew how much he was mistaken, by sending a Disease upon him, such as Blindness, which St. *Paul* inflicted on *Elymas*, or delivering to Satan, to which others were subjected. For these were plain signs, by which it appeared that God approved of the Apostles Doctrin. But in ordinary Excommunication the case is otherwise: For all that can be concluded from *that* is, that when any one upon the springing up of some new Controversies, was excommunicated for disagreeing with the Bishop of the Church to which he belonged, the Bishop and the rest perhaps of the Clergy were of another Opinion; which might as easily be the worse of the two as the better.

better. For Excommunication was a certain evidence of Mens differing among themselves, but not that the excommunicate Person was in an error; because one that had the Truth on his side, might be excommunicated by ignorant and prejudiced Persons. But if any were chastised in the manner aforesaid by the Apostles, *viz.* by having a Disease inflicted on their Bodies, this was an infallible proof of their being Hereticks; because God would not have suffered any pious orthodox Person to undergo a Punishment which he had not at all deserved. Besides, that a Miracle wrought in confirmation of any Doctrin, such as this was, the present inflicting of a Distemper upon Mens Bodies, was of it self sufficient to shew the falsness of any thing advanced in contradiction to it, tho with some appearance of probability; but certainly the Excommunication of any Bishop, who might as easily abuse his Authority, as others fall into Error, was no sure evidence of any Man's being an Heretick. These two things therefore must not be confounded, nor the ordinary Governors of the Church equal'd to the Apostles in their Censures, any more than in other Gifts and Endowments, as our Author occultly does, whether designedly and knowingly I cannot tell, but I am sure without reason. Chapter XI.

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 2. *Note* a. I. THE first signification which our Author produces out of *Pollux*, sutes best with this place, for St. *Paul* does not say simply that he was an ἁρμοστὴς, or did ἁρμόζειν ἑκατέραν χειρὶ ἀνδρί; but ἡρμόσαμην ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ, which cannot otherwise be rendred than *I have espoused you to one Man* or *Husband*. Which words we rightly read with a *Comma* after them, which cannot be transferred after the Verb παρασῆσαι, but absurdly, so that I wonder Dr. *Hammond* should judg that to be the best punctation. The following words παρθένον ἁγνὴν παραστῆσαι τῷ χριστῷ, ought, as they are rightly by *Grotius*, to be rendred, *that I may present or deliver you a chast Virgin to Christ*. A Virgin is first *espoused* to one Man, and afterwards she is delivered to him. And because it was possible, and sometimes also happen'd, that a Virgin who was espoused to any Man, upon intervening strifes, or for some other reason was given in Marriage to another, and that between her Espousals and Marriage she might be vitiated; St. *Paul* says, *I have espoused you to one Man, even Christ*, and I never intended that this Match should be broken off, or suffered you to be privately corrupted by any other, but have done my utmost to keep you pure, *that I might present you a chast Virgin to him.*

Chapter XI.

him. Of those things which might fall out between Espousals and Marriage, we may read Interpreters on *Mat.* i. 18. Now the Christian Church in this World seems to be only espoused to Christ, and the Marriage between them not to be celebrated till all other things are consummated: so that many things may fall out between that spiritual Espousing and Marriage, and really do so, whereby the Church which is espoused to Christ is vitiated and defiled, or sometimes also married to another. The *Corinthian* Church was by St. *Paul* espoused to Christ; but before he presented it, and delivered it as it were into his hand, false Apostles might allure it again to the love of Heathenism, or wed it to another opinion almost as bad as that, by which means the Espousals of that Church would have been made of none effect.

II. The Doctor does not seem sufficiently to have distinguished between the nuptial Solemnity and Espousals, because he alledges a passage out of *Cinnamus*, where the Discourse is about the marriage Solemnity, which he immediately subjoins to the place cited out of *Pollux*, as parallel to it. He had better have produced some examples out of *Herodotus*, in which the word ἀρνέσασθαι clearly signifies *to espouse*, and which have the more agreement with this matter, because the Virgins of which that Historian speaks, were not as yet delivered to their intended Husbands, the very thing which St. *Paul* was sollicitous about, as to the spiritual Marriage of the *Corinthian* Church with Christ. And he in *Lib.* 5. c. 47. speaks thus about one *Philip* the Son of *Butacidas*: ἀρνησάμενον Τέλυος τὴν Συβαρείτιν θυγατέρα, ἔρυγε ἐκ Κρότωνος· Ψευδὴς δὲ τοῦ γάμου εἶχε πλέων εἰς Κυρήνην: *having espoused the Daughter of* Telys a Sybarite, *he fled from* Croton, *and being disappointed of the Marriage, he sailed to* Cyrenæ. And Lib. 6. c. 65. Ἀρνησαμένου Λαμπίδεω Πέρκαλον τὸν Χίλωνος τὴν Δημαρμένου θυγατέρα, ὁ Δημάρητος ἐξαπατήσας ἐπιτρόπῳ Λαμπίδῃ τὸν γάμον φήσας αὐτὸς, τὸν Πέρκαλον ἀρπάσας καὶ ὢν γυναῖκα: when Percala *the Daughter of* Chilo *the Son of* Demarmenes *had been espoused to* Leutychides, Demaratus *by Treachery deprived* Leutychides *of the Marriage, coming himself and taking away* Percala *and marrying her.* And *Lib.* 9. c. 107. speaking of *Xerxes*, who espoused at *Sardis* the Daughter of his Brother *Masistes*, he saith: ἀρνησάμενος δὲ καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα ποιήσας, ἀπήλαυνεν εἰς Σοῦσα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐσῆλθε ἀπίκετο καὶ ἤγαγετο ἐς ἑωυτοῦ Δαρείῳ τὸν γυναῖκα, &c. *Having espoused her, and performed what was customary, he went to* Susa: *And being come thither, and having led home to* Darius *his Wife*, &c. By these examples it appears that St. *Paul* may properly enough be said ἁρμόσασθαι *to have espoused* the *Corinthians* to Christ; seeing that word is applied as well to a Guardian, or him that *espouses*, as to the Man to whom a Virgin

Virgin *is espoused.* Nor is there any other Notion of this word to be look'd for, where the Discourse is about Marriage, this being then the perpetual signification of it; tho if St. *Paul* had spoken of any thing else, it might perhaps be said that he had a respect to the custom of the *Lacedæmonians*, which our Author now unnecessarily supposes. Chapter XI.

Vers. 6. Εἰ δὲ ἰδιώτης λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει.] The word λόγῳ in this place signifies a stile or faculty of speaking, as it is opposed to knowledg in the Mind. As there are Persons of no great Learning, who yet are skilful in the art of speaking; so on the other hand there are a great many learned Men, who are unhappy in expressing their Conceptions, in which number St. *Paul* here reckons himself. For ἰδιώτης signifies one of the vulgar sort, a Person of no polite Learning. And agreeably ἰδιωτικοὶ, and ἰδιωτικαὶ λέξεις are Phrases vulgarly used among the common People. But here we must carefully distinguish things from words and their oratorical Disposition; for things in themselves very excellent, may be expressed ἰδιωτικῶς, tho those ἰδιωτικοὶ be not elegant, and ἰδιωτικῶς disposed, tho the disposition be improper. In respect of knowledg the Apostle *Paul* was not ἰδιώτης rude or ignorant; but he does not deny but his stile was ἰδιωτικὸς. Which because learned Men have not sufficiently understood, but have confounded things with words, I shall insist on a little more at large.

Orators differ in three things from the illiterate Vulgar, in discoursing upon any Subject. *First*, in *Invention* and choice of matter, in which they far surpass the ordinary sort of People; but this I need not treat of, the Discourse here being about Elocution. *Secondly*, in *Disposition*, the rules of which are laid down by *Rhetoricians*, and are unknown to the Vulgar. *Thirdly*, in *Elocution*, or choice of words and Sentences: And as to these two last, *Idiots* never equal Orators unless it be by chance, and in a very short Discourse. So that ἰδιωτικὸς λόγος is a Stile or Discourse, in which neither the Laws of Disposition nor Elocution, such as are laid down by the Masters of Rhetorick, are observed; tho it be otherwise full of excellent Sentences, and shew the Speaker to have a great measure of Wisdom and Knowledg.

In *Diogenes Laertius* in *Platone*, §. 87. according to the opinion of *Plato*, ὁ λόγος διαιρεῖται εἰς πέντε, ὧν εἷς μόριόν ἐστιν οἱ πολιτευόμενοι λόγοι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, οἱ καλοῦνται πολιτικοί: *Discourse* or *Stile is divided into five kinds, whereof one is that which the Administrators of the Commonwealth make use of in publick Assemblies, and is called Political.* Of this kind is the stile of *Demosthenes* and other Orators, whose Employment lay in pleading at Court. Ἑπτέα δὲ διαφέρει λόγῳ, ὃν οἱ Ῥήτορες χρῶνται, εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τὸ συμφέρον, ὃν ἰγκώμια καὶ ψόγοι καὶ κατηγορίαι. Τὸ δὲ πιθανὸν ὅλως ἐστὶ ῥητορικὸν. *Another kind of*

Chapter XI.

of Stile is that which is used by Rhetoricians, and is for ostentation, in which are written Encomiums, and satyrical Discourses and Accusations; and this kind we term Rhetorical. Such is the Stile of *Isocrates*, and other Rhetoricians, who spent all their time in Schools. This latter kind has more of Grace and Ornament in it than the former, otherwise there is no difference between them. Τρίτη ἡ διαφόρος λέξις, ἣν οἱ ἰδιῶται διαλέγονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἥτις καὶ ἰδιωτικὴ καλεῖται: *A third kind of Stile is that which Idiots*, or illiterate Persons, *use in common discourse*; *and this is called Idiotick.* That is the Stile which I before described, and which is used by St. *Paul*. And it is not opposed only to the painted Eloquence of Rhetoricians, but also to the Elegance of Politicians, to whose Stile that of the *Vulgar* is much inferior. This as to St. *Paul*, and the other Writers of the New Testament, has been shewn at large by *C. Salmasius* in Comment. *de Lingua Hellen.* Sect. 2. The other kinds of discourse mention'd by *Diogenes* I omit, because they are not to our present purpose.

But when I say that a *Rhetorical* or *Political* Stile excels that of the Vulgar or *Idiotæ*, my meaning is not that it surpassed it only in *Ornaments*, which do not belong to the Matter, but also in *Disposition* and Propriety of *words*, which very much contribute to the perspicuity of any Discourse. For which reason, one that is skilful in the Greek Language may much more easily understand *Demosthenes* or *Isocrates*, than St. *Paul*; not only because the stile of this latter has abundance of *Hebrew Idioms* in it, but because the order of his Sentences is many times inverted, his Phrases and Terms improper, and his Metaphors harsh. As *Diogenes Laertius* also, who wrote in an Idiotick Stile, and had no great regard to order or choice of words, is in many places very hard to understand. And such are, among the Greek Fathers, *Epiphanius*, and the Author *Historiæ Lausiacæ*, in whose Writings often occur the like difficulties, proceeding from negligence of Stile.

Which being so, I cannot sufficiently wonder why *Beza* was so angry with St. *Jerom*, because he did not admire St. *Paul*'s Eloquence, which setting aside his Matter, and considering only his Words, was certainly none at all. But let us hear *Beza* himself: *Quid igitur*, saith he, *an imperitus loquendi Paulus, & elinguis, ut Hieronimus existimat? What then, did not St.* Paul *know how to express himself, or had he not the use of his Tongue, as St.* Jerom *thinks?* No, he was not so perfectly *tongue-tied* neither, that the Substance of his Discourse and Doctrine cannot be understood; but his Stile is not so clear, nor his Expression so elegant, as to make every thing that he says easy, or pleasant to

critical

critical Ears. St. *Paul* did not aim at that diſpoſition in his Words which might facilitate the underſtanding of a thing in it ſelf obſcure, or render his Diſcourſe more plain and perſpicuous: which *Beza* very well knew, and no one can be ignorant of who has read but St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles in Greek. But *Beza* goes on, and ſaith: *Imo vero Chryſoſtomum potius, & doctiſſimos quoſque ex Græcis, ipſam denique rationem ſequutus, quamvis nativa illa & germana maſculæ facundiæ ornamenta ipſi videri poſſint non defuiſſe, fateor tamen illum fucatæ illius rhetorices pigmentis uti noluiſſe.* *Yea rather following St.* Chryſoſtom, *and the moſt learned among the Greeks, and Reaſon it ſelf, tho thoſe native and genuin Ornaments of maſculine Eloquence ſeem not to have been wanting in him; yet I confeſs he uſes none of thoſe colours of falſe Rhetorick.* But a clear way of ſpeaking, to begin with his laſt Words, and diſpoſing every thing we ſay in its right order, is no *fucus*. That artifice of thoſe Rhetoricians who endeavor to magnify by words, things that are in themſelves inconſiderable, or skim over thoſe that are baſe, may properly be ſtiled *fucus*, *daubing*; but not apt Expreſſions, or ſoft Metaphors, and an orderly diſpoſition of every part in a Diſcourſe; in which the Speaker has no other end than to make himſelf eaſily underſtood, and carefully to avoid all Ambiguity, which might lead his Hearers into a miſtake. And St. *Paul*'s ſtile is not only without *fucus*, but deficient alſo in theſe things, which are not diſcommendable: So that if we *follow reaſon*, we ſhall never ſay that St. *Paul* was eloquent; provided it be remembred we are ſpeaking of words, or diſpoſition, and not of matter. That St. *Paul*'s matter is praiſed by St. *Chryſoſtom*, and other Greek Fathers, and preferred before all the Arguments which the antient Greeks have treated of, I know, and none but a Mad-man will deny: but that they commended his Style, or the Order of his Words and Sentences as clear and elegant, I do not think; and if I did, their Authority would not move me, becauſe the contrary is ſo manifeſt. But they were not altogether ſo void of Underſtanding, as to attribute that Eloquence to St. *Paul* which he himſelf diſclaims. Nor does *Beza* himſelf diſagree with me in this matter, when he adds, that St. *Paul* would not make uſe of Rhetorick, *Ut vi ſpiritus hominum animos ad Chriſtum raperet, non autem Sermonis blanditiis, adulatorum more alliceret.* *That he might bring men to Chriſt by the Power of the Spirit, and not allure them after the manner of a Flatterer, by ſmoothneſs of Speech.* Which is as much as if he had ſaid, Thoſe who are affected with what St. *Paul* ſays, are affected with his Matter, not with his Words or Expreſſion, as being brought by the Spirit of God to an Enquiry and Love of the Truth, tho deliver'd in a rude Stile.

Chapter XI.

Chapter XI.

He adds: *Cum orationis ipſius totam indolem & charakterem propius conſidero, &c. When I more narrowly conſider the whole Strain and Form of his* (the Apoſtles) *Diſcourſe, I muſt needs ſay I never could ſee any ſuch Loftineſs in* Plato *himſelf, when ever he undertakes to thunder out the Myſteries of God; any ſuch δεινότης Majeſty* or *Force in* Demoſthenes, *when ever he applies himſelf either to terrify Men with the fear of the Divine Judgment, or to admoniſh them, or to draw them to contemplate the Goodneſs of God, or to exhort them to the Duties of Piety and Mercy; or laſtly a more exact Method in teaching, even in* Ariſtotle *or* Galen, *who were otherwiſe very excellent and skilful Artiſts.* If we conſider the things themſelves, I acknowledg all this to be very true, but we are ſpeaking now about Stile and Order of Diſcourſe; in which as thoſe Authors mentioned by *Beza* were ſuperior to St. *Paul*, ſo as to things themſelves they are vaſtly inferior. Yet I do not deny but there occur even in St. *Paul* alſo, ſome Sentences admirably well expreſſed, but then they are but rare, and his Stile is for the moſt part barbarous, as the Speech of *Idiotæ* uſes to be. But as things of ſmall moment in themſelves being ſet off with Rhetorical Colours, are and have been often admired; ſo on the other hand, things of the greateſt importance have many times made an obſcure and ill ordered Diſcourſe to be extolled; wheras thoſe two things ſhould be diſtinguiſhed and ſeparatly conſider'd.

I have been the larger upon theſe things, that I might ſhew in what ſenſe, and how truly the Apoſtle here calls himſelf ἰδιώτην λόγῳ: and what I have ſaid may be of exceeding uſe to direct us in the interpretation of theſe Books; for knowing that they are written in a rude Stile, we muſt not go about to anatomize every ſingle Word or Expreſſion in them, or examin all that is ſaid with a kind of Geometrical Exactneſs, which the nature of an Idiotic Stile will not bear, which regards things only in general, and not every minute or particular circumſtance; nor may we deduce too rigorous Conſectaries from any phraſes uſed in theſe Writings, which thoſe who ſpeak rudely never think of. We muſt have always before our Eyes the ſubſtance of the Goſpel, and the main deſign of the Speaker; and by that his expreſſions muſt be explained, rather than by an over-nice and ſubtil ſcanning of every word. But this is a Subject which would require a whole Volume to treat of it as it deſerves; in this place it may ſuffice to have touched briefly upon the chief heads.

Verſ. 9. *Note* b. It is certain that καταναρκῶ ſignifies *to be burdenſom, eſſe oneri*, as it is render'd in the *Vulgar*, or ſomething like it, that ſignifies a Man's living upon another's Charity. But the only difficulty

ficulty is how the word καταναρκῶν comes to have this ſignification. The Doctor conjectures that it is *to ask* or *importune*, becauſe they that ask any thing of another, cauſe a *chilneſs* or *numneſs* in thoſe whom they ask. But this is harſh and forced: The paſſage which he refers to in *Seneca* is in Lib. 2. *de Beneficiis*, c. 2. But *Seneca* does not ſpeak of a Perſon of whom any thing is asked, but that asks; and therefore that paſſage is nothing to the purpoſe: *Moleſtum verbum eſt*, ſaith he, *onerosum, & demiſſo vultu dicendum, Rogo: I ask, is a troubleſom and burdenſom word, and muſt be ſpoken with a ſubmiſſive look.* I had rather ſay that καταναρκῶν is *to be burdenſom*, becauſe thoſe who are benummed with a Diſeaſe, are much heavier than ordinary, whence by a Metaphor it was uſed to ſignify to be a burden to others through Poverty. Whence St. *Paul* elſewhere expreſſing the ſame thing, uſes the word βαρέω, 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 9. *For ye remember, Brethren, our labour and travel: for working night and day, becauſe we would not burden any of you, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν, we preached unto you the Goſpel of God.* See likewiſe 2 *Theſſ.* iii. 8. This Interpretation is confirmed by the oppoſition which is made in this very Verſe between καταναρκῶν and ἀβαρῆ ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν, *to keep himſelf from being burdenſom.*

Verſ. 22. Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ. Ἰσραηλῖταί εἰσι; κἀγώ. σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; κἀγώ.] The falſe Apoſtles with wonderful haughtineſs, boaſted that they were *Hebrews*, that they were *Iſraelites*, that they were the Seed of *Abraham*; the very ſame thing expreſſed ſeveral ways, for *Emphaſis* ſake; which St. *Paul* here, to ſhew the vanity of that empty, vainglorious boaſting, imitates. *Quanquam eadem fere ſunt, & unâ ſententiâ cooriuntur, plura tamen eſſe exiſtimantur, quoniam aures & animum ſæpius feriunt: Tho they are almoſt the ſame things, and come all to one ſenſe, yet they are thought to be many, becauſe they ſtrike ſeveral times upon the ears and mind*, ſaith *Favorinus* in *Gellius*, Lib. 12. c. 24. where he gives us ſeveral Examples of ſuch Repetitions out of the beſt Authors both Greek and Latin.

Verſ. 24. *Note* c. It is manifeſt that our Author had not look'd into the Paſſage which he cites out of *Joſephus*, in the Hiſtorian himſelf, becauſe he alledges it but by halves, and tranſlates it abſurdly: It is in *Lib.* 4. *c.* 8. in theſe words: Τὸ δ' ὑπερῳδοῦντι, καὶ σφετερίσαντι ἐπιτιμίαν ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ διαβολὴν σφίσιν ἐκπύστου, πληγὰς τεσσαράκοντα μιᾶς λειπούσης λαμβάνειν: *For his bold and raſh Accuſation and Calumny, let him ſuffer puniſhment, receiving forty ſtripes ſave one.* Our Author abſurdly renders the word ἐκπύστου, *let him extend himſelf*, as if it were ἐκτανύσθω, which would be a corrupt reading, if it were any where extant, becauſe there is nothing that can be referred to the word σφέτερον, except

Chapter XII.

ἐπιτίτο or ἐπιτίν, as other Copies read it, that is, *luat, let him ſuffer.*

Verſ. 25. *Note* d. Since ſeveral other hardſhips, which St. *Paul* here ſays he had undergon, as his being thrice ſcourged by the *Jews*, &c. are not mentioned by St. *Luke*, I do not doubt but he has omitted alſo this of his having been in the Deep. And hence it may be infer'd, that Arguments drawn from St. *Luke*'s ſilence about any thing are not very ſtrong, becauſe he has not written an entire Hiſtory of St. *Paul*'s Actions, even for the time that his Hiſtory refers to.

Verſ. 32. *Note* e. Mr. *Pocock* in his Notes on *Greg. Abul-Farajius* his *Hiſtory* of the People and Cuſtoms of the *Arabians*, p. 77. acknowledges that many of the *Gaſſanii* were called *Haretbi*, or *Aretæ*; but he tells us, he never obſerved that all the *Arabian* Chiefs were ſo ſtiled by them, as *Joſ. Scaliger* affirmed. But *Scaliger* does not ſpeak of the Kings of *Damaſcus*, but of the *Hagarens*, whoſe ſtrongeſt Fort was *Petra*. See Lib. 2. de *Emend. Temp.* p. 111. *Ed. Roverianæ.*

CHAP. XII.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. Ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ is rightly here interpreted by *Grotius*, a *Chriſtian*, whom our Author ought to have followed, ſince there are manifeſt Inſtances of this Phraſe in that ſenſe, as I have ſhewn on *Rom.* xii. 5. It is a thing to be wonder'd at, that Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphraſe on *Rom.* xvi. has not once rightly interpreted this Phraſe. The Examples which he here alledges, are perfectly forein to his purpoſe, and all the likeneſs between them is only in the Particle ἐν.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. If St. *Paul* had ſaid ſimply, that *there was given to him a Meſſenger of Satan, that thruſt a* σκόλοψ *Twig in his Fleſh*, I ſhould eaſily believe that this paſſage were rightly underſtood by Dr. *Hammond* and other Expoſitors, of ſome Perſecutions which St. *Paul* ſuffered. But ſeeing he ſays, there *was given me a Twig in the Fleſh, a Meſſenger of Satan to buffet me*; I rather think a moleſtation from ſome particular evil Spirit is here meant, who continually afflicted him, and put him to as great pain as if he had thruſt a Twig into his Fleſh, and brought as much contempt upon him as if he had been buffeted; St. *Paul* not being ignorant of the cauſe of his ſuffering ſo many Evils. And becauſe it is before ſaid, *Leſt the greatneſs of the Revelations ſhould exalt me*, or *leſt I ſhould be lifted up above meaſure by the excellency of the Revelations*; I am apt to think that the word σκόλοψ is an alluſion to ſome very ſharp piece of Wood, not of any ſort whatſoever,

ſoever, but one which ſhould be placed over a Man ſtooping, ready to prick him grievouſly when ever he roſe up. Let us repreſent to our ſelves the caſe of *Regulus*, whom the *Carthaginians* κεντήσασι ἐν γαλαγῇ κέντρα πάντοθεν ἔχοντι διέφθειραν, *killed by ſhutting him up in a Cage that had Goads on all ſides*; which are the words of *Appian* in Lib. 1. Which way ſoever he moved himſelf, the Goads prick'd him. And ſomething like this would be the caſe of a Man who ſhould have ſome ſharp Stakes or wooden Spears hanging over him, whilſt he bowed his body, that would run into his Fleſh, whenever he raiſed himſelf. And ſo if St. *Paul* grew proud, or ſuffer'd himſelf to be puffed up becauſe of the Revelations which he had received from God, there was ready at hand an evil Spirit, who had obtained permiſſion of God to oppoſe him, to torment and afflict him. Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 8. Περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.] Theſe words, in my judgment, ſhew that it is not any ſort of Perſecutions ſtirred up by Men againſt St. *Paul* (which he was always ready to ſuffer for the ſake of the Goſpel) that are here ſpoken of; but a particular evil Spirit, which, as it were, accompanied St. *Paul*, and wherever he went, did him all the miſchief he could, either of himſelf, or by men as his Inſtruments.

Verſ. 11. Ἠναγκάσατε.] It ſeems then by this, that it is not always unlawful for a Man to ſpeak in his own praiſe. See *Plutarch*'s little Treatiſe *de laude ſui*.

Verſ. 21. Πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ.] Our Author thinks the Apoſtle has a reſpect here to *the unnatural luſts practiſed at Idol-Feaſts*; as if there were no Feaſts kept by the Heathens in honour of their Idol Gods where ſuch Luſts were not practiſed, whereas it is certain that the Heathens, eſpecially in *Greece*, ſeldom mixed any ſuch vile practices with their Religious Solemnities, as I have already elſewhere more than once obſerved. See on 1 *Cor.* v. 10. So that I rather think any ſort of unlawful Luſts whatſoever are here intended.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. THO the conjecture which our learned Author here propoſes be ingenious; yet if it be more narrowly examined, it will be found not to be ſo probable. His principal reaſon why St. *Paul* ſhould be thought to have had a reſpect to the words of Chriſt in *Mat.* xviii. is this, that he makes uſe of ſome part of thoſe words, *viz. In the mouth of two or three Witneſſes every Word ſhall be eſtabliſhed.* But theſe were not

Chapter XIII. the words of *Christ*, but of *Moses* in *Deut.* xix. 15. and St. *Paul* in reciting them may as well be supposed to have had a respect to that place in *Moses* as the other in St. *Matthew*: which of the two is so much the more probable, because St. *Paul* does not subjoin them to a discourse about Censures, but a Journey he was to make to *Corinth*; which now he purposed the third time, because he had been twice before disappointed. So that it is all one as if he had said: "I have twice resolved already to come to you, and yet have been frustrated in my "design; but a third resolution which I have taken up about the "same thing, shall not be defeated; as that which was confirmed by "the testimony of three Witnesses under the Law, could not be "made void. It is an adapting the words of *Moses* to the present business, κατ' παρουσίαν, as the learned *Grotius* observes.

II. Dr. *Hammond* unnecessarily joins the word διάτεγον, ver. 2. to τοῦτο, from which it is separated by the Participle παρών, when from the order of the words as they now lie, arises this very commodious sense; "I have told you already before, and foretel you again, as intending "to be with you a second time, and being absent I now write, that I "will not spare, &c. Παρὼν here is all one with μέλλων παρεῖναι, as *Grotius* observes. The Apostle had been once already at *Corinth*, and he intended to go thither again. The *Hebrews* having no *future Participles*, it is no wonder that St. *Paul* speaking after the manner of the *Hebrews*, uses a Greek Participle in the Present Tense for the Future. See my Notes on *Gen.* vi. 7. & *Exod.* iii. 2.

III. That passage in *Mat.* xviii. is supposed by our Author to belong chiefly to private Persons, and not to the Governours of the Church, to whom it is not thought that this Precept, *Tell it to the Church*, can be directed, without doubt, because they themselves are supposed to be the *Church* whereof Christ speaks; which ought to have been proved, this being not an Age wherein Men are apt to believe every thing that serves to magnify the Governours of the Church; or else it had been better to have said nothing. Of the passage in *Tit.* iii. 10. I shall speak when I come to it, for it is nothing to the *Doctor*'s purpose.

Vers. 4. Ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ.] Dr. *Hammond* refers the word θεοῦ here to *Christ*; but the stile of St. *Paul* shews that God the Father is intended. See *Rom.* iv. 24. & viii. 11. & x. 9. 1 *Cor.* vi. 14. & xv. 15. 2 *Cor.* iv. 14.

Vers. 5. *Note* b. I. It may be not unfitly conjectured, that the word ἀδόκιμοι in this place is used in an *Active sense*, for one that cannot δοκιμάζειν *prove* or try, and so the sense will be: Except ye are unable

able to try things, you will know that the true Gospel has been preached among you by a true Apostle. But I confess I have never yet met with the word ἀδόκιμος used any where else in this sense. Chapter XIII.

II. I cannot tell in what Copy our Author read the Particle δὲ *certainly*, for I have never read it in any. If he thought that it was an Omission, he ought to have told us his mind. However, St. *Paul*'s words here are *Elliptical*, and signify what Dr. *Hammond* would have them. It is all one as if the Apostle had said; *Do ye not know that Christ Jesus is among you?* Ye must needs certainly know it, *unless ye are uncapable of trying and judging in such a case.*

Vers. 11. *Note* c. I. Our Author in this Annotation follows those who deduce the word ἄρτιος and its Derivatives from the Verb ἄρω, that is, *to fit*; which derivation is not altogether so certain. But grant it to be true, yet he should have observed that the Verb καταρτίζω does not immediately come from ἄρω, and therefore should have had a greater regard to its nearest Original. From ἄρτιος, which signifies *entire, safe, perfect*, is first made the Verb ἀρτίζω, which is properly ἄρτιον ποιῆν, *to make, to perfect*, as it is taken in *Theocritus* Idyll. 13. or *Hylæ* Vers. 43. Νύμφαι χορὸν ἀρτίζοντο, that is, ἐχόρευον *danced*, saith the *Scholiast*. And because those things which are designed for any particular use, ought to be ἄρτια, *entire* and *perfect* in their kind, or *fit*, if the forementioned etymology of the word be approv'd; therefore ἄρτιος signifies also *fit*, and *made ready*, in *Homer* and *Herodotus*, and ἀρτίζειν in *Hesychius* is explained by ἁρμόσαι, συναγαγεῖν, πλέξαι, *to fit, to gather together, to knit*, and ἀρτίσασθαι by κατασκευάσασθαι, *to make, to prepare*. And so in *Suidas* there are two places alledged, in which this Verb signifies, *to be set in order*, or *prepared*: Οἱ δ' ἀρτιζόμενοι ἐπέλευσαν τῷ Νύμφῃ, *being set into order, they divided the Army.* Ὁ δὲ παντοῖος ὢν, ἐν ἅπασι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ τυχὸν ἀδήλων ἀρτισάμενος, *but he being subtil, and prepared for all the uncertainties of Fortune.* But the *Compounds* of the Verb ἀρτίζειν are much more in use, and especially the Verb καταρτίζειν.

II. The primary signification of this Verb, as of the simple, is *to make, to perfect, to finish*. For which reason in *Suidas* it is interpreted by τελεῖν, without the addition of any other signification. But afterwards it signified, 1. *To make ready, to fit*; 2. To *repair*, or *restore*; which significations belong as well to the Mind as to the Body: 3. To *reconcile*, or *bring to agreement*. Of all which Examples may be had out of *Lexicons*, and especially *Henr. Stephanus*, whom I shall not here transcribe. The same *Lexicographer* has observed also that καταρτισμὸς is said by some to be used by *Plutarch* in the Life of *Themistocles* for *institution*, of which by and by. The Old *Onomasticon* renders

καταρ-

Chapter XIII.

καταρτίζω by *struo, instruo, construo, perficio, reficio*; *to build, to set in order, to join together, to perfect, to repair.* I shall now apply what has been said to the Scripture Examples.

III. Καταρτίζειν a *House*, a *Wall*, a *Body*, is to make or finish them, as κατασκευάζειν, not to *compact* them. Καταρτίζειν δίκτυα is to *repair* or *make ready Nets*, to make them ἄρτια entire and prepared. Κατηρτισμένος λόγος is *to prepare* or *make praise.* Κατηρτισμένος μαθητὴς is *a perfect Disciple*, as *Beza* in his Notes on St. *Luke* has shewn. Καταρτίσαι ὑστερήματα must be rendred with the *Vulgar*, *complere quæ desunt*, *to fill up what is wanting*, that is, *to perfect.* Καταρτίσαι ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ is *to perfect in every good work*, or to render perfect and compleat in all kinds of Virtue. *Vessels* κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν are Vessels *prepared for destruction.* God is said κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας, that is, *to have made the World*, κατασκευάσαι. In all this we meet with no such Notion of the word as that of *compacting.*

IV. To discuss likewise the other places alledged in *Ephes.* iv. 12. Καταρτισμὸς ἁγίων, is *the perfection of the Saints*, or the compleatness of all its Members, so that nothing is wanting to the Church, εἰς διακονίαν ἔργου, which is necessary for *the Work of the Ministry*, or for the performing all Offices in the Church. In *Gal.* vi. 1. the Verb καταρτίζω has the signification of *restoring*, as Dr. *Hammond* well observes. So, as *Budæus* remarks, καταρτίζειν signifies to put Members out of joint into their right place again; whence it might be applied to the recovering a Person whose mind is disturbed and put out of its natural posture. In this place, *Chap.* xiii. 9. of 2 *Cor.* κατάρτισις is the *soundness* of the Body, and consequently its *health*; as in *Hesychius* ἄρτιον is not only explained by ὁλόκληρον, *sound* or *entire*, but also by ὑγιὲς *healthful.* In 1 *Cor.* i. 10. κατηρτισμένοι signifies *unanimous. I beseech you, Brethren*, saith St. *Paul*, *that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, but that ye be* κατηρτισμένοι, *joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.* In that signification this word is more than once used in *Herodotus*, as appears by *Æmilius Portus* his *Lexicon Ionicum.* In which sense it seems to be here taken in *Chap.* xiii. 11. of 2 *Ep.* to the *Corinth.* In 1 *Pet.* v. 10. καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς will be best rendred *perficiat vos*, *make you perfect*, with the *Vulgar.* All which being clear, if the immediate Original of the word καταρτίζω, and the use of it in other Authors be attended to, I do not see why we should run to another signification deduced from a more remote Etymology, and of which no certain Instance can be alledged.

V. As for the word κατάρτισις, I don't know whether it signifies just the same as κατάρτισις; but there is a passage in *Plutarch*, in the Life of *Themi-*

Themiſtocles, in which it ſeems to ſignify the ſame, as it does in the words of *Hippodamus*, viz. in *pag.* 112. *Ed. Francof.* where he tells us, that *Themiſtocles* uſed to ſay, τὰς τραχυτάτας πώλους ἀρίστους ἵππους γίνεσθαι, ὅταν τὴν προσήκουσαν τύχωσι παιδείας καὶ κατασκευῆς: *That the fierceſt Colts become the beſt Horſes, when they have that management and bringing up which is requiſite.* And to this place *Henr. Stephanus* ſeems to have had a reſpect, tho he reads κατάρσεως inſtead of κατάσεως. But between theſe two, as there is no great difference in the ſound, ſo neither ſeemingly in the ſignification. And therefore Dr. *Hammond* had no reaſon to think that καταρσίους in *Heſychius* was a corrupt reading for καταρτίους; the Verb καταρτάω being as true Greek as καταρτίζω, and having that ſignification which *Heſychius* in the place alledged aſſigns it. Chapter XIII.

And this is abundantly ſufficient to confute the little ſubtilties of our Author in this place, interpreting the Greek word rather by arguing, than according to uſe.

Verſ. 14. *Note* d. I. From this place it may be gathered, that we ought not to diſpute too ſubtilly from the order of words in the New Teſtament, ſince *Chriſt* is here mentioned before the *Father*: *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all.*

II. Χάρις Χριστοῦ is *the favour of Chriſt*, from which all his Benefits flow, not his *Liberality*, properly ſpeaking. Χάρις does not ſignify *Charity*, nor would *Caritas Dei* in Latin ſignify the Love of *God* to us Men, but *our* Love to God. I wiſh our Author had cited more exactly the Paſſage which he refers to in *Cicero*, by ſetting down the *Chapter*, or noting the *Page*, for I cannot find it; and any one that underſtands Latin, will preſently ſee that it is miſquoted.

III. Κοινωνία Πνεύματος I rather take to be *the Communion of the Spirit*, or the common fruition of Spiritual Graces, whereby all are made partakers of them. So the word κοινωνία is taken in 1 *Cor.* x. 16. & *Phil.* i. 5. ii. 1. iii. 10. & 1 *John* iii. 6, 7. Our Author indeed interprets κοινωνίαν πνεύματος, in *Phil.* ii. 1. *actively* alſo, of the Liberality of the Holy Ghoſt, but without reaſon; for who will grant him that that interpretation is rightly deduced from the following words, as if *Bowels* and *Mercies* ſignified Liberality? But ſee the Notes on that place.

Chapter 1.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to the *Galatians.*

AT the end of the *Premon.*] I. We have no certain ground to believe that those whom St. *Paul* confutes in this Epistle were Uncircumcised; but it is much more probable they had received Circumcision, whether they were *Jews* or *Gentiles.*

II. That the Christians had so much reason to be afraid of the *Jews* in *Galatia*, that the *Gnosticks* should be forced to feign themselves *Jews* when they were not, is not at all likely. For the *Roman* Magistrates, as appears by the instance of *Gallio*, did not give much ear to the Accusations of the *Jews*, or lend their Axes or Rods to the Circumcised. And that without the Magistrate the *Jews* could do any great matters, will not be thought by any who know what was the form of the Roman Government. So that it had been much better to say that St. *Paul* here opposes the *Jews*, who indeed had embraced the Christian Religion, but yet were tenacious of their antient Customs and Ceremonies.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 1. ΚΑΙ Θεῦ πατρὸς.] We must supply here the Preposition Ἀπὸ, that there may be a perfect opposition thus: οὐκ ΑΠ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ΔΙ' ἀνθρώπων· ἀλλὰ ΔΙΑ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ΑΠΟ Θεοῦ πατρὸς: *not from Men, neither by Men; but by Jesus Christ and from God the Father.* Besides, it is certain that *God* the Father did not call St. *Paul* immediately, but by *Christ*, who appeared to him as he was on his Journey to *Damascus.*

Vers. 7. Τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες.] Dr. *Hammond* brings into his Paraphrase on this place not only his *Gnosticks*, but Men that by birth were *Heathens* and uncircumcised; as if in *Galatia* they had been under the same

ſame neceſſity of endeavouring to gain the favour of the *Jews*, as in *Judæa*. But there ſhould have been ſomething in St. *Paul* to ſupport this interpretation, otherwiſe it may very reaſonably be rejected, as I have already ſaid at the end of the *Premonition*. It is more than probable that theſe diſturbers of the Churches of *Galatia* were *Jews*, and conſequently circumciſed, and had embraced the Goſpel, the Deſign and Virtue of which they did not however underſtand. I confeſs *Grotius*, in the Preface to his Annotations, had gone before our Author in the contrary Opinion; but how great ſoever the Authority of that learned Man is with me, when it is not accompanied with ſolid Reaſons, it does not in the leaſt move my aſſent. Chapter I.

He thinks that St. *Paul is more vehement in this than in his other Epiſtles, becauſe thoſe who would have deprived the called among the* Gentiles *of their Liberty as to the* Jewiſh *Ceremonies, were not* Jews, *whoſe zeal for their Religion might in ſome meaſure be excuſed, but Strangers who lived in* Judæa, *of whom the chief was* Cerinthus. But it's true, it was a pardonable thing in the *Jews themſelves* to obſerve the antient Rites impoſed upon their Nation, and to be willing that the reſt of their Countrymen ſhould obſerve them, provided they were otherwiſe obedient to Chriſt; but to impoſe them upon the *Gentiles*, and endeavour to make all the World ſubmit to the ſame Yoke, this ſurely could no more be born in the *Jews* than in others. Beſides, there is nothing here that gives the leaſt ground to think that thoſe who were ſo zealous for the obſervation of the *Moſaical* Ceremonies, were by birth *Heathens*. But *Grotius* goes on and ſays: *And ſuch were thoſe who at* Philippi *taught the ſame Doctrine, as St.* Paul *himſelf tells us*, Phil. iii. 3. To which I ſay, it appears indeed by St. *Paul*'s words that there were ſome at *Philippi*, who gloried in the Circumciſion of the Fleſh; but they were *Jews* and not *Gentiles*: *For we*, ſaith St. *Paul*, *are the Circumciſion, who worſhip God in the Spirit, and glory in Chriſt Jeſus, and have no confidence in the Fleſh.* In which words he has undoubtedly a reſpect to the *Jews*, who gloried in fleſhly Circumciſion, as the context evidently ſhews. So that I wonder that both *Grotius* and our Author ſhould alledg this place.

The ſame Men, ſaith the learned *Grotius*, *aſſerted the neceſſity of conforming to the Law of* Moſes, not out of any *principle of true Piety, but that they might grow rich and great by the aſſiſtance of the* Jews. But I confeſs I do not ſee what Honors or Profits Men that were Heathens and Uncircumciſed could expect from the *Jews*, a People deſpiſed and hated by the *Romans*, and that in a *Roman* Province, as *Galatia* ever ſince the time of *Auguſtus* had been, as we are told by *Strabo*, Lib. 12.

Chapter I. wiſh either of theſe learned Men had eſſayed to prove more at large what they ſay, for they would preſently have perceived the vanity of ſuch an undertaking. But perhaps *they thereby avoided thoſe preſſures which lay upon the Chriſtians, for in thoſe times the* Jews, *by the Roman Laws and Edicts, had the free exerciſe of their Religion; which the Chriſtians had not, but begun then to be perſecuted, as appears from the Acts, and other Epiſtles of St.* Paul. To which I anſwer, if ſuch as were not heartily and really *Jews*, had a mind to eſcape perſecution, they ought rather to have feigned themſelves *Heathens* than *Jews*, in *Galatia*. Beſides, tho the *Jews* were allowed the profeſſion of their Religion in the *Roman* Empire, they had not therefore any power granted them over others, ſo as to be able to do any hurt to the Chriſtians. They might indeed by Calumnies, and ſuch kind of unjuſt Methods, endeavour to miſchief them, but that was all they could do, as ſufficiently appears from the Acts of the Apoſtles. And they annoyed the *Chriſtians* that way, who were reſolved to obey all Chriſt's commands, and firmly adhered to their purpoſe, whom upon that account they accuſed and charged with Sedition; but they could not moleſt Men, who if it were neceſſary feigned themſelves to be *Heathens*, of which ſort were the *Gnoſticks*.

Verſ. 8. Ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.] Our Author in his Paraphraſe rightly thinks that this has a reſpect to the *ſecond degree of Excommunication*; but I don't well underſtand what he means by the laſt words: *that none is to have any commerce with in ſacred matters.* For if we may judg of the effects of Excommunication by the Doctrin of the *Rabbins*, excommunicated Perſons were neither excluded out of the Temple nor the Synagogue, as Mr. *Selden* has ſhewn, *de Synedr. Judæorum*, Lib. 1. cap. vii. It was only unlawful to converſe with them familiarly, and within the ſpace of four Cubits, as the ſame Author has proved at large. And if the Chriſtians at that time behaved themſelves otherwiſe towards the excommunicated, our Author would not have ſpent his time ill to have ſhewn it us: For it is not ſafe to judg of what was done in thoſe Primitive times, by the practice of latter Ages.

Verſ. 10. *Note* b. Tho our Author in this Annotation follows *Grotius*, yet I cannot aſſent to either of them for this reaſon, becauſe the Verb πείθειν, according to the perpetual uſe both of Sacred and Profane Writers, always ſignifies elſewhere *to perſwade*, and never *to appeaſe*. I can neither find after the moſt diligent ſearch, nor remember any paſſage in any Author I have read, in which it can be reaſonably taken in any other ſenſe; and if I can ſhew that this ſignification will agree to all the inſtances produced by the learned *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, there will be then no neceſſity of recurring to any other.

And

And this it will be very easy to do, when I have only premised that there is an *Ellipsis* in all the alledged examples, in which that which is wanting must be supplied to shew what the Verb πείθω in them signifies. Chapter I.

In the example out of the Book of *Samuel*, there is a manifest *Ellipsis*, which must be thus supplied: καὶ ἔπεισε Δαβὶδ τοὺς ἄνδρας αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀναστῆναι ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα, and David *perswaded his Men not to kill the King*. Not he appeased them, but he prevailed with them not to slay him.

A *Patron* or *Advocate* is said indeed πείθειν δικαστήν, but that is *to perswade the Judg*, not *to appease* him; that is, perswade him that his Cause is just. For if πείθειν δικαστήν could be rendred *to appease the Judg*, there should be added the *Person* of the *Accused*, or whose cause is pleaded, in the *Dative* case thus: πείθειν δικαστὴν τῷ κατηγορουμένῳ or τῷ κείνοις, *to appease the Judg to the party accused* or *contending*, which yet there is no instance of.

In *Mat.* xxviii. 14. there is the like *Ellipsis*, which must be supplied again in this manner: if this come to the Governor's ear, ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτὸν, *we will perswade him*, μὴ ἀγαναχτῶν ὑμῖν, *not to be angry with you, and secure you.*

So in this place, ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεὸν, is all one as if St. *Paul* had said: *do I perswade God or Men* μὴ ἀγαναχτεῖν καὶ *not to be displeased with me.* And thus all those Phrases must be understood, in which neither the *Case* of the *Defendant* nor any *Infinitive mood* is subjoined to the Verb πείθω, which often occurs, contrary to what *Beza* thought. I know *Henr. Stephanus*, and other learned Men, render it then, *flectere*, *to incline* or *bend*; but it's plain they have more regard to the sense than the proper signification of the word; and in all that multitude of examples which are alledged in the *Thesaurus Linguæ Græcæ*, the Figure *Ellipsis* takes place. I shall instance only in one, by which we shall be able to judg of the rest. In *Plutarch*, in Lib. *de cohibenda Ira*, *Euclides* to his Brother who had angrily said, ἀπολοίμην εἰ μή σε τιμωρησαίμην, *let me perish if I be not revenged on you*, returns this mild answer, ἀπολοίμην εἰ μή σε πείσαιμι, *let me perish if I cannot bend you*, *Peream nisi te flexero*; in which Version the sense indeed is expressed, but not the just import of the word. For we must supply συγγνῶναι καὶ τοῦτο: *If I cannot perswade you to forgive me this* [offence] or some such thing. And that such Supplements as these are understood in all these Phrases, may appear by infinite examples of intire expressions wherein the Verb πείθειν is made use of, some of them to be had out of any *Lexicon*. I have been the larger in disputing against our two learned Men about this word, lest mere reasoning from some few places, contrary to the rules of Grammar and constant use, should prevail: A thing which *Grotius* is very seldom guilty of, but Dr. *Hammond* often, as I have shewn.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. THAT correction according to which inſtead of ιδ', that is, *fourteen*, we ought to read δ'. *four*, is propoſed by *Lud. Cappellus* in *Hiſt. Apoſtol. Appendice*, Character 4. which is worth conſulting, becauſe he ſtarts a great many difficulties there againſt our Author's Chronology. And that Conjecture was approved by *Grotius*, becauſe of the connexion of the Diſcourſe: Yet Dr. *Pearſon* has excellently ſhewn in his *Annales Paulinæ*, that St. *Paul* here reckons the years that had paſſed from the time of his Converſion. But he refers the *Jeruſalem Synod* to the year of Chriſt xlix, and makes St. *Paul*'s Converſion to have happen'd two Years later than Dr. *Hammond*, and that with good reaſon. Conſult himſelf, and compare him with *Cappellus*.

Verſ. 6. *Note* d. I. It is very true what our Author here ſays about St. *Paul*'s Solæciſms, which others uſing a ſofter term call σολοικισμὸν *ſeeming ſolæciſms*. But it matters not much by what name they are called, if we do but agree as to the thing. And it is univerſally acknowledg'd by thoſe who underſtand Greek, that there are a great many expreſſions in the Writings of St. *Paul*, which cannot according to the rules of Grammar be reſolved into proper Conſtruction. The examples alledged by Dr. *Hammond*, put this matter out of all doubt: yet ſome learned Men have made it their buſineſs to collect a certain number of ἀναχόλουθα & ἀναντιδότα *inconſequences* and *incoherences* out of the beſt Authors both Greek and Latin, to ſhew that the Stile of St. *Paul* ought not therefore to be accounted the leſs elegant. But there are two things which may make it appear that thoſe Authors are ill compared with St. *Paul*. The *firſt* is, that thoſe forementioned defects do ſeldom occur in *them*, whoſe whole Diſcourſe is otherwiſe agreable to the Rules of Grammar, and has all thoſe ornaments which are requiſite to make it proper and elegant. On the contrary, the ſtile of St. *Paul* is both deſtitute of all thoſe things which are ſo much admired and commended in any Diſcourſe, (I ſpeak of words and not of Matter) and has abundance of *ſeeming Solæciſms*. *Secondly*, the moſt elegant *Heathen* Writers, tho they were at the ſame time very well skilled both in Grammar and Rhetorick, do *deſignedly* ſometimes violate the Rules of Grammar for variety ſake, leſt their Stile ſhould ſeem too ſtudied and artificial; which therefore may be look'd upon as ſo many *Figures*, and a particular ſort of elegancy. But St. *Paul* naturally *falls*, as it were, into theſe kind of ἀναχόλουθα & ἀναντιδότα,

ἀναπολόγητα, becauſe regarding things and neglecting words, he thought it enough if he were underſtood by an attentive and diligent Reader, who loved the Truths he declared. So far is he from *deſignedly diverſifying* his Diſcourſe with that kind of Negligence, that he does not ſeem to have aimed at ſo much as the common ornaments of Stile. Let us hear about this matter *Quintilian*, in Lib. 9. cap. 3. *Eſſet*, ſaith he, *omne ſchema vitium, ſi non peteretur, ſed accideret.* ——— *Virtus eſt, ſi habet probabile aliquid, quod ſequatur. Una tamen in re maxime utilis, ut quotidiani & ſemper eodem modo formati ſermonis faſtidium levet, & nos a vulgari dicendi genere defendat. Quo ſiquis parce, & cum res poſcet utetur, velut adſperſo quodam condimento jucundior erit. At qui nimium affectaverit, ipſam illam gratiam varietatis amittet*, &c. *Every figure would be an imperfection if it were not choſen, but caſual.* ——— *It is an excellency if it have ſomething probable following it. But there is one thing in which it is moſt uſeful, and that is to take away that nauſeouſneſs which is bred, by forming our Diſcourſe always after the ſame manner, and to keep us from a vulgar way of expreſſion: Which if any one ſparingly uſe, and only when the thing requires it, it will give a grateful reliſh as it were to his Diſcourſe. But if he unneceſſarily affects it, he will loſe all that agreableneſs which a Variety would otherwiſe cauſe*, &c. Now I do not think there is any one will ſuppoſe that St. *Paul* purpoſely *choſe* thoſe harſh and frequent ἀνακολουθα, to make his Diſcourſe leſs diſtaſtful to his Readers. And therefore it remains that they be looked on as Defects and *Imperfections*, which yet are no prejudice to his matter, becauſe the Goſpel is a very plain and eaſy thing, which does not need to be illuſtrated by any Light deſcending upon Elegancy, or exactneſs of Expreſſion. It is well ſaid by St. *Jerom* on *Chap.* vi. of this *Epiſtle* to the *Galatians*, verſ. 1. *Qui putant Paulum juxta humilitatem & non vere dixiſſe*, etſi imperitus Sermone, non tamen ſcientia, *defendant hujus loci conſequentiam. Debuit quippe ſecundum ordinem dicere:* vos qui ſpirituales eſtis, inſtruite hujuſmodi, in ſpiritu lenitatis conſiderantes voſmet ipſos, & vos tentemini; *& non plurali inferre numerum ſingularem. Hebræus igitur ex Hebræis & qui eſſet in vernaculo ſermone doctiſſimus, profundos ſenſus aliena lingua exprimere non valebat*; nec CURABAT MAGNOPERE DE VERBIS, CUM SENSUM HABERET IN TUTO. *They who think that St.* Paul *ſpake only out of Modeſty, and not the real truth, when he ſaid*, tho I am rude in Speech, yet not in Knowledg, *let them defend the Connexion of this place. For according to good Syntax he ought to have ſaid*, Ye that are Spiritual reſtore ſuch a one in the ſpirit of Meekneſs, conſidering *your ſelves*, leſt *you* alſo be tempted, *and not have brought a Singular number upon a Plural.*

Chap. II.

Chapter II. *Plural. But being a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and very skilful in his own Native Dialect, he could not expreſs his profound ſenſe in another Language*; and AS LONG AS THE SENSE WAS SAFE, HE DID NOT MUCH CONCERN HIMSELF ABOUT WORDS.

II. The Paſſage referred to by our Author in the ſame St. *Jerom*, in *Comment.* ad *Epheſ.* iii. I have ſet down a little more fully [*in my Latin Tranſlation*] than the *Doctor*, who did not complete the ſenſe, but ended at the word *adnotamus*; and it is thus: *Quotieſcunque ſolæciſmos aut tale quid adnotamus; non Apoſtolum pulſamus, ut malevoli criminantur, ſed magis Apoſtoli aſſertores ſumus*, &c. *Whenever we take notice of any Solæciſms or the like, we do not injure the Apoſtle, as ſome malicious Perſons would lay to our charge, but we do him ſo much the more Juſtice*, &c. Our Author adds, *and ſo Epiſt. cap.* 1. Quæſt. 10. which I have omitted, becauſe to produce the teſtimony of St. *Jerom* in that manner is abſurd, and I could not find the paſſage to which he referred. I don't think he look'd himſelf into St. *Jerom* when he ſent us to that place: For otherwiſe he would certainly have cited him with more care, and inſtead of thoſe Divines which he alledges, appealed to the Teſtimony of St. *Jerom*, whoſe Authority is much more conſiderable. And with St. *Jerom* he might have joined *Origen* who lays down this Rule, of which more at large in cap. 8. *Philocaliæ*: ὡς δεῖν τὰ σολοικισθέντα, καὶ μὴ σώζοντα τὴν κατὰ τὸ ἑπτὰν ἀκολουθίαν ῥητὰ ἢ γεγραμμένα, ὅσον χωρεῖν διερθῶσαι, πλὴν τῆς συνέσεως δυναμένους τὸ τῆς διανοίας ἀκόλουθον σώζοντα: that *we ought not to attempt the correcting of any ſeeming Solæciſms, or verbal incoherences in Scripture, where to diſcerning Perſons the ſenſe is well enough connected.*

Verſ. 11. *Note* g. I. I do not think that from an ill interpretation of one place in the Old Teſtament, we ought to deduce an unheard of ſenſe of the word καταγινώσκειν, as if it therefore ordinarily ſignified the ſame with the Hebrew uſed in that place. One ſingle place in the *Septuagint* where they arbitrarily fix a ſenſe upon a word which they could not properly render, does not change the uſe of a Language, as I have already elſewhere ſuggeſted: For they uſed the word καταγινώσκω, not becauſe they thought it ſignified juſt the ſame with the Hebrew חקר, but becauſe it contained a ſenſe not altogether diſagreable to that place, as they imagined. So that I chuſe here to follow the vulgar Interpretation, and eſpecially ſeeing it beſt ſuits with the context, viz. *when* Peter *was come to* Antioch, *I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed*; that is, becauſe he did what he ought not to have done, not becauſe *he was look'd upon by others as a Diſſembler.* For *firſt* he did really pretend to avoid the Society of the *Gentiles*, which he uſed not to do, nor ought to have done. And *ſecondly*, others did not

ſee

see him dissemble, because by his example and manner of Life, the *Gentiles* began to be perswaded that they were obliged by the Jewish Laws. So that it is rightly observed by *Grotius*, after a great many others, that the *Participle* καταγνωσμένος here is the same with the *Verbal* καταγνωστός. Chapter III.

II. The Passage in *Ecclesiasticus* makes nothing at all to the purpose, which is thus: ὄνει τῷ κλέπτῃ ἔστω αἰσχύνη, καὶ κατάγνωσις τοῖς δισσολόγοις. *Shame is upon the Thief, and an evil Condemnation upon the double Tongue*; that is, they are at length condemned, and suffer a shameful Punishment. I do not see any necessity of interpreting κατάγνωσις here by *detection*.

Vers. 14. Ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν.] They are said *to compel* not only who use Commands, Threatnings, or Violence; but those who when they say or do any thing, others dare not but follow their Example or Authority, or cannot neglect any thing which they would have them do, without great prejudice to their Interest or Reputation. So the word ἀναγκάζειν is taken in 2 *Cor.* xii. 11. where St. *Paul* says that the *Corinthians* had so carried themselves towards him, that to keep up his Reputation he was *compelled* to speak somewhat more highly and honourably of himself than he would otherwise have done. And to the same sense the Latin *cogere* is used by *Cicero* in the beginning of his Book *de Amicitia*, where *Lælius* speaking to his Sons-in-law, who had earnestly entreated him to discourse concerning *Friendship*, says: *Vim hoc quidem est afferre, quid enim refert qua me ratione cogatis? Cogitis enim certe, studiis enim generorum, præsertim in re bona, cum difficile est, tum ne æquum quidem obsistere. This is pure compulsion; for what does it signify what way you take to force me? For force me you certainly do; for not to comply with the desires of my Sons-in-law, especially in a good thing, as it is hard, so it is unreasonable.*

CHAP. III.

Vers. 1. I. IF the *Ebionites* were so called from an Opinion, I am *Note* a. apt to think *that* name was given to them by the Christians, after the writing of this *Epistle* in which their Doctrin is called πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα κόσμου, *beggarly Elements of the World*, chap. iv. 9. And this seems to be intimated by *Origen* in the beginning of his 2d Book *contra Celsum*, where he says: Οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν πιστεύοντες ὑπὸ καταλελοίπασι τὸ πάτριον νόμιμον· βίωσι γὰρ κατ' αὐτὸν ὑπονυμοι τῷ ἀπὸ τῆς πτωχείας τοῦ νόμου γεγονημένοι. Ἐβίων τις γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις καλεῖται, καὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι χρηματίζειν οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι·

Chapter III. *The Jews, who believe in Chriſt, have not forſaken their antient Law; for they live according to it, and are ſurnamed from the poverty of their Law. For* Ebion *in the Hebrew Language ſignifies Poor; and thoſe of the Jews who receive Jeſus as the Chriſt, are called* Ebionites. And it's true that in Hebrew אביון *ebjon*, is uſed indeed for Poverty, but never for Folly that I know of, tho I have made diligent ſearch. But to ſpeak what I think, I am of opinion that this name of *Ebionites* belonged to ſome poor *Samaritans*, who had embraced the Goſpel; but not being ſufficiently acquainted with its Doctrins, had mixed their antient Religion with it: which mixture they too obſtinately adhered to, when they might have learned better from the Apoſtles and other Chriſtians. The reaſon why I think they were *Samaritans* and not *Jews*, is this very conſiderable one, that they received only the Law of *Moſes*, and rejected the *Prophets*, as *Epiphanius* in their Hereſy tells us, which was a principal part of *Samaritaniſm*. See *Num.* xv. It's certain the *Ebionite* who wrote the *Clementine Homilies*, alledges only the Law: Nor is it any wonder that theſe Men were *poor*, becauſe they were univerſally hated, both by *Jews*, *Chriſtians*, and *Heathens*, who none of them took any care to relieve their Neceſſities.

II. But I do not think that St. *Paul* hath a reference here to theſe Hereticks, becauſe he upbraids them with nothing but their obſtinate adherence to the *Moſaical* Ceremonies; the obſervation of which they endeavoured to impoſe alſo upon the *Gentiles*. Our learned Author will have them to be the *Gnoſticks*, whom for that reaſon he repreſents as the Promoters of all kind of Hereſies. But whereas the Caſe as to the *Gnoſticks* is doubtful, it is certain that the *Jews* of that Age who had received *Chriſt*, were very zealous for having the *Moſaical* Rites obſerved; and there is nothing ſaid here by the Apoſtle which does not exactly agree to them. And therefore we ought not to feign St. *Paul* to have had any other Adverſaries. Tho if any one think fit to call ſome of the Jews *Gnoſticks*, becauſe they boaſted of an extraordinary meaſure of γνωσις *knowledg*, with all my heart.

III. The Alluſion which Dr. *Hammond* ſuppoſes the Apoſtle here might have to the name of *Ebionites*, is vain: for it is not true that their name ſignifies *folly*; nor is it neceſſary, becauſe St. *Paul* calls the *Jewiſh* Rites πτωχα *poor and beggarly*, that therefore he ſhould be ſuppoſed to have a reſpect to that name, becauſe there are other reaſons, and thoſe very conſiderable ones, for his ſpeaking in that manner, as we ſhall ſee on *Chap.* iv. 9.

Verſ. 8. *Note* c. What our Author ſays here at laſt are mere Niceties; but nothing can be truer, than what he has before, as I have

ſhewn

ſhewn on *Gen.* xii. 3. and thoſe who carp at it never conſider'd the Reaſons which Dr. *Hammond* and I have there given, which yet they ought to have done before they condemned us. Chapter III.

Verſ. 10. Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶ, &c. *to the end of Verſ.* 11. and *Verſ.* 21, 22. Εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, &c.] All theſe *Verſes* I ſhall interpret together, becauſe tho they are disjoined in place, they are united in ſenſe. In interpreting the Law of *Moſes*, and enquiring into its nature, the firſt thing to be taken care of, is, that we do not confound things which are diſtinct, that is, the Law it ſelf as it is recorded in *Moſes*, and may be underſtood according to a literal and ſimple interpretation of the words, with the Opinion of the *Jews*, prevalent in St. *Paul*'s time, and againſt which he here diſputes. For otherwiſe we ſhall hardly be able to reconcile St. *Paul* with *Moſes*, or with right Reaſon.

If we conſider the Law of *Moſes* as it is ſet down in the *Pentateuch*, we ſhall plainly perceive that it was very difficult indeed to obſerve all the Rites therein preſcribed; but yet that it was not ſuch as that the performance of it was impoſſible, as I have ſhewn on *Deut.* xix. 9. And indeed *Moſes* every where ſuppoſes that it might be obſerved, as all Lawgivers alſo do; and if they did not, there ſhould be no Laws made, becauſe it is abſurd to make Laws which cannot be kept, and unjuſt to puniſh Men for not doing what they cannot do. Nor indeed is the Law of *Moſes* ſo very ſevere, as not to pardon the leaſt Sin, or to require ſuch a degree of Holineſs as is above human ſtrength: As appears only by two things which put the matter beyond all controverſy. *Firſt*, That God had inſtituted Sacrifices for ſome Sins; I do not mean *ritual*, but *moral*, upon the offering up of which he promiſed to forgive the penitent Offender; of which we have ſeveral Inſtances in *Levit.* v. 4. & vi. 2. *& ſeqq.* *Secondly*, That he ſuffered Divorces, which were contrary to Charity, and might be attended with very great Inconveniences, as every one eaſily ſees. Such is the Law conſidered in it ſelf, if we examin it a little more cloſely.

But the *Jews* in St. *Paul*'s time, had got quite another Notion of it, and boaſted it to be the moſt compleat and perfect Pattern of Sanctity imaginable; as appears by ſeveral places in *Joſephus*, and particularly in his Books againſt *Appio*, and of them chiefly the 2*d*. And it ſignifies nothing to ſay that the *Jews* otherwiſe thought, and did thoſe things which ſhew that they ought not to have had ſuch a Notion of their Law, if they would be conſiſtent with themſelves; for it is certain they frequently both did and ſpake Contradictions.

Chapter III.

The ſame Perſons interpreted ſeveral places in the Law, not *grammatically*, as *Lawyers* uſe to do the Roman Laws, but *Theologically*; that is, not with a bare regard to the uſe of the Language and the connexion of the Diſcourſe, but to their Opinions, with which they made the Law to agree, as is evident from ſeveral places in *Philo*, *Joſephus*, and the *Talmudical* Doctors. For they made their Traditions equal to the Law, which Chriſt often upbraids them with. As for inſtance, The *Rabbins* uſed (as appears by the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, and the Citations of St. *Paul* in this place) to interpret *Deut.* xxvii. 26. as if the meaning of *Moſes* there was, that God required of them the moſt perfect Holineſs, which if they did not perform, they were to expect to be curſed by him. But in reality, all that *Moſes* ſays, is only that the People were to curſe him *that did not confirm the words of the Law to do them*, as I have ſhewn in my Notes on that place.

St. *Paul* who diſputes here againſt the Jews, and endeavours to overcome them with their own Weapons, reaſons from theſe Opinions of theirs, and ſhews that ſuppoſing the Truth of what they aſſerted, it was manifeſtly impoſſible any Man ſhould be accounted juſt before God by the Law, becauſe they acknowledged that all men were Sinners. So that it is all one as if the Apoſtle had ſaid: "You ſay, O "Jews, that ye expect Juſtification from God by the Law, and think "that the Law is a moſt perfect Rule of Life. From whence it follows that you lie under the Curſe of the Law, becauſe you have not "perfectly kept it, for you do not pretend to be abſolutely ſinleſs; and "by your own conceſſion, the Law denounces a Curſe upon all that do "not perfectly obey it. So that you cannot hope for Juſtification by "the Law, but muſt ſeek it from the Goſpel.

If it be enquired how I know St. *Paul* does not reaſon here from the thing it ſelf, but upon the Jews Principles? I anſwer, By his citing the place of Scripture here alledged, not as it really is, but according to the Interpretation of the *Rabbins*. For the words of *Moſes* are theſe: ארור אשר לא יקים את דברי התורה הואת לעשות אותם *Curſed be he that confirmeth not the words of this Law, to do them.* Which the *Septuagint* render, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου ποιῆσαι αὐτούς. And theſe St. *Paul* follows as far as the word πᾶσι, but then changes the reſt into πᾶς γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. But doubtleſs he would never have alter'd any thing in the words of *Moſes*, nor followed the *Septuagint* at all, but render'd the Hebrew himſelf exactly, if he had reaſoned from the bare Authority of the *Prophet*, and not from the Opinion of the *Jews*. And it is common with St. *Paul* to cite the Old Teſtament, ſo as it

was

was uſually alledged by the *Doctors* of the *Jews*, whom they called דרשנים *darſchanim*; that is to ſay, with little regard to the circumſtances of the place, or the proper ſignification of the words, and to argue from them ſo alledged, becauſe that was the cuſtom of the *Jews*. See but the place cited out of the Prophet *Habakkuk* Chap. ii. 4. in *verſ.* 11. Chaper III.

Verſ. 11. Ἐν νόμῳ δὲ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.] That is, by perfect Holineſs, for the *Law* and a pattern of perfect Holineſs was the ſame in the opinion of the *Jews*. And the thing it ſelf is true, tho the *Jews* had a wrong Notion of the Law's perfection; which truth of the thing it ſelf made St. *Paul* expreſs himſelf as the *Jews* did, tho not ſo accurately as they ſhould have done.

Verſ. 13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου.] There are three things here worth our enquiring into, which moſt other Interpreters ſecurely paſs over. *Firſt*, who are meant by the word ἡμεῖς us; *Secondly*, what is *the Curſe of the Law*; *Thirdly*, how *Chriſt has redeemed us from it.*

By *us* we are to underſtand the *Apoſtle* himſelf and his Countrymen the *Jews* to whom the Law was given, not all Mankind. This is evident from the thing it ſelf, becauſe other Nations were utter Strangers to the Law of *Moſes*, which cannot be ſaid to have been given to ſuch as were always ignorant of it. Nay it was not given ſo much as to the *Jews* themſelves, who were born after the revelation of the Goſpel, and much leſs yet to Chriſtians tho they knew it; becauſe it was already abrogated before they came to the knowledg of it, yea before ever they had a being. The following words alſo ſhew that the *Jews* are oppoſed to the *Heathens* in this Verſe: and therefore what Dr. *Hammond* here ſays in his Paraphraſe, about the redemption of *Men* in general, tho it be true, does not belong to this place, becauſe the Diſcourſe is not about *all Mankind*, but the *Jews* only.

The *Curſe of the Law* here ſpoken of, ſeems to be that mentioned by *Moſes* in *Deut.* xxvii. and denounced upon thoſe who were guilty of ſeveral Impieties, and, as I before obſerved, who refuſed to *confirm the Law*, and did not think themſelves obliged by it. And thoſe who were *ſo* curſed, could not expiate their Sins by any Sacrifice, but ought to be puniſhed with Death; which becauſe it could not always be inflicted, (as in caſe the Crime or its Author was not known) therefore the Perſon ſo offending had a Curſe denounced upon him, or was pronounced worthy of all manner of Evils and Calamities: See my Notes on that Chapter of the Book of *Deuteronomy*. It is certain whilſt the Law remained in force, or before it was abrogated by God, all the *Jews* ought to have engaged to obſerve it; and it was not lawful for them to ſay

Chapter III. that they would not be obliged by it, or live otherwiſe than according to its preſcription. And if any of them did ſo, they unavoidably ſubjected themſelves to the Curſes of the Law: Nay thoſe who thought the Law required perfect Holineſs, and yet did not think themſelves perfectly Holy, ought, if they would be ſelf-conſiſtent, to look upon themſelves as under the Law's Curſe.

But Chriſt having eſtabliſhed a New Covenant, whereby that old Moſaical one was aboliſhed through his Death, did at the ſame time free the *Jews* from all the curſes contained in the Law; for whoever brings in a new Covenant, and makes new Laws, abrogates the old: Only that the *Jews* might partake of that Redemption, or be abſolved from the neceſſity of obſerving the Moſaical Law, and exempted from its Curſes, it was requiſite they ſhould embrace the Goſpel-Covenant, and keep it. And thus the *Jews* were *redeemed from the Curſes of the Law*, but not the *Gentiles*, who were never obnoxious to them, and, as St. *Paul* tells us in *Rom.* i. ſhall be *judged without the Law*. The *Jews* might therefore, after the New Covenant's being eſtabliſhed by the Death of Chriſt, deny that they were any longer obliged by the Law, and neglect its preſcriptions where they diſagreed with the Goſpel, without any fear of its curſes, to which God from that time ceaſed to have any regard.

Ibid. Γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα.] Namely, *for us Jews*; for *Chriſt* offering himſelf a Sacrifice to God the Father for all Mankind, and expiating thereby the Sins of all Men, died for the *Jews* as well as others, and at once reconciled them to God, and freed them from a neceſſity of obſerving the Law, which denounced a Curſe upon thoſe who tranſgreſſed it. Κατάρα here is for ὡς κατάρατος, as is rightly obſerved by *Grotius*; for nothing worſe could have befallen a Man whom the Law curſed, than Crucifixion. And ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is *in our room*: for as a Sacrifice is killed in our ſtead, and ſuffers that Death which we deſerved; ſo Chriſt died in the ſtead of the *Jews*, and all Mankind.

Ibid. Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ὑπὸ ξύλου.] Of this place I have treated at large on *Deut.* xxi. 23. and I ſhall not here repeat what I have there ſaid. All that remains is to ſhew that St. *Paul* does not diſagree with *Moſes*: *Moſes* had ſaid, that *he that is hanged is the curſe* or *abomination of God*, that is, according to the Statutes of the Law, a very polluted thing. But St. *Paul* follows the *Septuagint*, excepting that he omits the word θεοῦ, which they have, becauſe indeed it is not neceſſary, nay in the Greek Language might have bred a miſtake: For all that the Apoſtle means is this, that Chriſt was dealt with by the *Romans* as a vile Malefactor, tho he was perfectly innocent, and under-

underwent a very infamous Puniſhment, which according to the Cuſtoms of the *Jews*, render'd the Perſon ſo ſuffering a polluted thing; and a greater and more diſgraceful than which could not have been inflicted upon the moſt profligate and curſed Offender. So that ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρατος is here the ſame with κατάρας in the foregoing words. If St. *Paul* had added, *by God*, tho according to the Hebrew phraſe that ſignifies no more than what I have here ſaid, and ſhewn in my Notes on *Deuteronomy*; yet thoſe who underſtood only Greek might have been offended with an expreſſion which ſeemed to intimate *that Chriſt was curſed by God*, that is, hateful to God; which is ſo far from Truth, that God was always well pleaſed with Chriſt, and eſpecially then when he beheld him on the Croſs, performing or having performed the higheſt Office of Love to Mankind, and moſt ſignal inſtance of ſubjection to himſelf. It is certainly known that the *Jews*, who from that time did not ſufficiently underſtand the Hebrew Language, abuſed that phraſe. *Nobis*, ſaith St. *Jerom* on this place, *ſolet a Judæis pro infamia objici, quod Salvator noſter & Dominus ſub Dei fuerit maledicto. It is a thing we* (Chriſtians) *are often upbraided with by the Jews, as a matter of diſgrace, that our Lord and Saviour was under the curſe of God.* Chapter III.

Verſ. 14. Ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, &c.] While Chriſt eſtabliſhed a New Covenant through his Death, and thereby abrogated the old one, he did not only free the *Jews* from the Moſaical Yoke; but dying alſo for the *Gentiles*, he obtained from God the forgiveneſs of all their paſt Sins, if they did but believe and obey for the future: ſo that upon their Faith they are accounted juſt by God, in the ſame manner as *Abraham*. The Connexion therefore of this Verſe with the foregoing is this: "*Ver.* 13. *Chriſt* has delivered the *Jews* from a ne- "ceſſity of obſerving the Moſaical Ceremonies, and from the fear "of that Curſe which was threatned againſt thoſe of that Nation "who wilfully neglected them, or thought themſelves not bound to "obſerve them; having eſtabliſhed a New Covenant between God "and Men, by an ignominious and cruel Death, which may be called "curſed according to the ſtile of the Law. 14. And he has ſo freed "the *Jews* from the Moſaical Yoke, as at the ſame time to provide "that the *Gentiles*, upon whom it was never impoſed, and who by "thoſe Ceremonies were kept off from having any communion "with the *Jews*, might, ſetting aſide the obſervation of thoſe Rites, "be adopted into *Abraham*'s Family, become partakers of the ſame "benefits with *Abraham*, and embracing the Goſpel, receive the gifts "of the *Holy Ghoſt*, as well as the believing *Jews*.

Ibid.

Chapter III.

Ibid. Λάβωμεν διὰ τ πίστως.] It ſeems at firſt ſight that the word which here followed ſhould have been λάβωσι, becauſe the Verb ἔλεγεν went before in the third Perſon; but the reaſon of St. *Paul*'s uſing the *firſt*, is becauſe this latter part of the Verſe belongs as well to the *Jews* as the *Gentiles*, with whom he therefore here joins himſelf and his Countrymen.

Verſ. 16. Οὐ λέγει ϗ τοῖς σπέρμασιν.] It is highly probable that this was a commonly received way of arguing in the מדרשים *midraſchim* or Allegorical Interpretations of that Age. And the *Jews* indeed might *well enough* make uſe of it againſt the *Arabians*, *Edomites* and *Samaritans*, who boaſted that they alſo were the poſterity of *Abraham*, to ſhew that *the Promiſes made to* Abraham *and to his Seed*, did not belong to them. But if it be conſidered in it ſelf, it cannot be thought of any force by thoſe who have other Sentiments, becauſe the Hebrew זרע *zerah* is a *collective* name, and ſignifies any ſucceeding Generations whatſoever, tho of a different Race: Nay, as learned Men have obſerved, the *Jews* never uſed to apply the word זרעים in the *plural* number, but to the *Seeds* of divers ſorts of Plants. But it was ſufficient that this way of reaſoning was thought to be concluſive by the *Jews*, to give the Apoſtle ground to make uſe of it againſt them; and what *they* were wont to ſay on behalf of the *Iſraelites according to the Fleſh*, againſt the *Arabians*, *Edomites* and *Samaritans*, St. *Paul* might properly enough alledg in honour of thoſe who were *Iſraelites according to the Spirit*, to overthrow the carnal *Jews* with their own Weapons. I have already before obſerved, that St. *Paul* diſputes againſt the *Jews* upon their own Principles, and there will be other examples of that in this Epiſtle.

Verſ. 16. *Note* d. Tho the word *Chriſt* elſewhere ſignifies the Head of the Church, in conjunction with his Body or Members; yet in this place I rather think it is uſed for his Body alone, that is, Chriſt's Diſciples: for there is nothing in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, properly ſpeaking, promiſed to *Chriſt*; but rather Chriſt himſelf was promiſed therein to *Abraham*, together with all his Benefits.

Verſ. 19. Παρεβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη.] That is, God did not acquieſce in the Revelations he made to *Abraham*; but when he ſaw that the Iſraelites *tranſgreſſed* all rules of Piety and Vertue, he *added* the Moſaical Law, to keep them in ſome meaſure within the bounds of their Duty, till the *Meſſias* ſhould come. This is all that St. *Paul* here means, whatever our Divine pieces up his Paraphraſe with.

Ibid. Σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται.] *So* undoubtedly it muſt be read, and not ᾧ ἐπηγγέλται, as may appear from the 16*th* Verſe, where the Promiſes are

are ſaid to have been made τῷ σπέρματι *to the Seed*, not *the Seed it ſelf* promiſed. That is only a correction made by ſome Criticks, who thought *Chriſt* to be here intended, whereas St. *Paul* ſpeaks about Chriſtians of all Nations, who without Circumciſion, after the example of *Abraham*, were accounted juſt and righteous before God, upon the ſole obſervation of the precepts of the Goſpel. And theſe are called κατ' ἐξοχὴν *the Seed of* Abraham, becauſe they obtain Juſtification while uncircumciſed; and the promiſes made to *Abraham*, at that time uncircumciſed, are fulfilled in them in a more *eminent* ſenſe than in the believing *Jews*, as St. *Paul* himſelf ſhews in *Rom.* iv. Chapter III.

Verſ. 20. Ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.] I cannot ſufficiently wonder at Dr. *Hammond*'s Paraphraſe of this Verſe, and if he had paraphraſed the reſt of this Chapter in the ſame manner, I ſhould have quite loſt my labour in tranſlating him. For who would ever have imagined that the Apoſtle meant any thing like what he ſays, upon reading only St. *Paul*'s words? At this rate of paraphraſing a Man may make any thing what he pleaſes of any Verſe of Scripture. This Verſe therefore muſt be better explained.

It ſeems to be brought in by way of *Parentheſis*, for the 21*ſt* Verſe is manifeſtly to be joined with the 19*th*, and ſo to be conſider'd as a digreſſion in which the Apoſtle upon occaſion of the word μεσίτης, admoniſhes the *Galatians* as he goes along, that as the Covenants made by God with Men were more than *one*, ſo each had their diſtinct Mediators, tho God himſelf was one. The words ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστι ſignify *is not one*, as appears from the oppoſite member of the Sentence, *but God is one*; tho they properly ſignify *is not of one*, πράγματος or ἐναγγελίου or ſome ſuch word being to be underſtood. It is all one as if St. *Paul* had ſaid: I told you that there was a Mediator between God and the Antient Hebrews; becauſe tho God be one and the ſame, yet he has not appointed *one* ſingle *Mediator of one* Goſpel, but the Law likewiſe had its Mediator, viz. *Moſes*. Which comes to no more than if the Apoſtle had ſaid, *there is not one Mediator*; for to ſay that the Law had a Mediator appointed it as well as the Goſpel, is nothing but to ſay that it is not one only that may be called by that Name. If it be asked why St. *Paul* admoniſhes the *Galatians* of this; I anſwer that it is an *Exegeſis* by way of *Parentheſis*, of the word μεσίτης, which kind of Parentheſes are very frequent in St. *Paul*'s writings. See *Epheſ.* ii. 5. and iv. 9, 10. This I thought to be the ſenſe of this obſcure place, which if not true, does however very little depart from the Apoſtle's words; whereas nothing can be more diſtant from them than Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation.

Chapter III.

Verſ. 21. ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι.] The Apoſtle here argues upon the *Jews Hypotheſis*, as I have before ſaid, who affirmed that God required perfect Holineſs in the Law; upon which ſuppoſition, no Man can be juſtified by it, nor conſequently attain to Life. Otherwiſe *Moſes* every where ſuppoſes and takes it for certain, that it was poſſible to obſerve the Law; but he had not that Notion of the Law which the later *Jews* had, who interpreted every thing *myſtically*. And according to theſe Mens Sentiments St. *Paul* here diſputes, and not that of *Moſes*: Which unleſs we obſerve, it will be impoſſible to reconcile the Prophet with the Apoſtle.

Verſ. 24. Παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν.] In this particular St. *Paul* does not reaſon from the Sentiments of the *Jews*, but declares his own Mind, tho it be a Conſectary neceſſarily following from what went before, ſuppoſing the truth of the *Jews* opinion concerning the perfection of the Law. But the ſame alſo might be inferred from the Nature of the Moſaical Law it ſelf, as that which contain'd only the στοιχεῖα *elements* of the Chriſtian Religion. And thoſe who are taught only the Elements of a thing, are ſtill under a Schoolmaſter. This might be proved by other Arguments if it were neceſſary: So that what in it ſelf was true and relied upon firmer grounds, *that* St. *Paul* proved alſo from the Jewiſh Opinion, by this means the more effectually to put the *Jews* to ſilence, a thing which he often does. Such is the perverſneſs of Mankind, eſpecially in matters of Religion, that they are not moved ſo much by cogent Reaſon, as by prejudices and opinions taken up in their Childhood. Such is the pride of Mens Hearts, that they cannot bear to have their Errors confuted or inveigh'd againſt, eſpecially when their miſtakes are of a long ſtanding and grown inveterate, or when thoſe who are charged with Error have been always judged by their own party to be in the right, and look'd upon as learned and judicious Men. And for theſe reaſons *Chriſt* and the Apoſtles reproved as few of the *Jews* miſtakes as they could, *viz.* thoſe only which would not conſiſt with Chriſtianity; but their other prejudices that had no very bad conſequences attending them, and which their obſtinacy would not ſuffer the eradication of to be attempted without manifeſt danger, they choſe rather to bear with, and to reaſon againſt them upon their own principles, becauſe they perceived that that way of arguing had the greateſt influence upon them. But ſeeing we now live in a time in which we are to ſearch out the Truth more for our *own* uſe, than for the uſe of the *Jews*, it is our part, after the diſcovery of it, to ſet it down juſt as it is: Becauſe if we do not, we ſhall never underſtand the Apoſtle's Writings, nor be

be able to defend them againſt the objections of Infidels; yea perhaps (which God of his infinite Mercy prevent) inſtead of a ſolid Piety eſtabliſhed upon its own Light and Evidence, all our Religion may degenerate into but dark and fearful Superſtition. Chapter IV.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 3. Ὅτε καὶ ἡμεῖς.] That is, we *Jews*; for the *Gentiles* were never under the diſcipline of the Jewiſh Law, which they were ignorant of, and from which they were excluded by the very nature of the Law. For it was a Law given to one Nation living in one Country, the Land of *Canaan*. This deſerved here to be noted, becauſe if it be not obſerved, the whole Diſcourſe of the Apoſtle in this place will be very obſcure.

Ibid. Στοιχεῖα κοσμικά.] The *ſame* St. *Paul* calls ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, in *verſ.* 9. And there is no doubt but he means the Moſaical Law; whence it may be again inferred that St. *Paul* did not think, with the *Jews*, that that Law was a perfect rule of Sanctity: For if he had been of that mind, how could he have called it *the Elements of the World*, and *weak and beggarly Elements?* The *elements* are the rude beginnings of any Art or Science, and far from containing the whole art in its greateſt Extent and utmoſt Perfection. Which being ſo, undoubtedly he thought thoſe *Elements* might be obſerved by Men if they were conſider'd in themſelves, as they are in *Moſes*; tho perfect Holineſs, ſuch as the *Jews* affirmed the Law to be a complete pattern of, was never by any Man, excepting the Saviour of all Men Chriſt Jeſus, expreſſed in his Life.

But it will be ſaid, it may be that St. *Paul* has a reference to the Ceremonial part of the Law, and not that which is Moral. To which I anſwer, by confeſſing indeed that he has a reſpect *chiefly* to the Ritual part of the Law, but ſo as not to *exclude* the *Moral* part of it, nor conſequently the Moral Law it ſelf; which if compared with the Commands of Chriſt, comprehends only the *Elements* of true Piety, as ſufficiently appears from *Mat.* v. and the following *Chapters*. For many things were lawful under the Moſaical Law, relating to Manners, which are there forbidden by Chriſt. What the Moral Law given by *Moſes* commands is indeed Good and Holy, and what it forbids Evil; but it is not a perfect rule of Holineſs, that is, it does not command every thing that is Holy, nor forbid every thing that is evil. For inſtance, Husbands loving their Wives to ſuch a degree as to bear with their Manners, and never to put them away but in caſe of

Chapter IV. Adultery, is a vertue not enjoined in the Mosaical Law; as the contrary Inhumanity in putting them away at every turn, is not therein prohibited, nay is expresly permitted, if they did but give them a Bill of Divorce. See *Mat.* v. 31, 32.

Vers. 5. Ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ.] That is, the *Jews*, or their *Proselytes*, as is rightly observed by *Grotius*, who upon embracing the New Covenant, were no longer oblig'd by the Laws of the old, to which they were before subject. See my Note on *Chap.* iii. 13.

Vers. 6. Τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.] The words *Spirit of his Son*, are capable of two senses, both which St. *Paul* seems to have comprehended under this Phrase. *First*, by the *Spirit of Christ* may be meant the Spirit which Christ had promised to the Apostles and the rest of the Christians, which he accordingly afterwards sent down upon them, and by whose power they were enabled to work Miracles. For on the effusion of that Spirit upon them, the *Jews*, and such as of *Gentiles* had embraced the *Jewish* Religion, perceived that they were then much more bountifully dealt with than when they were under the Law, and called upon God afterwards with greater assurance, no longer now behaving himself as a hard Master, or requiring the observation of superfluous Rites upon the severest Penalties, but as a most gracious and compassionate Father. Whence that Spirit is said *to cry Abba Father*, that is, to make the *Jews* upon their Conversion to the Christian Religion, to look upon God as a Father and not as a severe Master. *Secondly*, by *the Spirit of his Son* may be meant such *an affection of Mind* towards God as was in his *Son*; as the *Spirit of Elias* and the like. And that Affection was produced in the minds of the *Jews*, by the knowledg and participation of the Benefits of the Gospel. Both these Spirits jointly residing in the minds of Men, seem to be called by St. *Paul* πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας *the Spirit of Adoption*, in *Rom.* viii. 16.

Vers. 8. Τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεὸν, &c.] St. *Paul* here speaks not to those who were φύσει *by birth Jews*, and had been brought up in the knowledg of the true God, but those who were made *Jews* θέσει by *assumption*, that is, Proselytes to the *Jewish* Religion before their Conversion to Christianity. And it appears that what the Apostle here says, has a reference to such Persons, because he afterwards demands of them, how they could *turn again* (πάλιν) *to the weak and beggarly Elements*; that is, to the Jewish Rites which they had before, in part at least, observed. If Dr. *Hammond* had not overlook'd this, which is obscurely intimated by *Grotius* on *vers.* 5. he would have given a much more clear and exact Paraphrase of this and the following Verse.

Ibid.

Ibid. Μὰ φύσι θεοῖς.] That is, to Gods which Men had made and invented for themſelves; for the oppoſite to τὰ φύσει is τὰ θέσι, that is, things which depend upon the decrees and inſtitutions of Men. That this place ought to be thus underſtood, I have ſhewn at large in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 2. *Sect.* 1. *Cap.* vii. Chapter IV.

Verſ. 9. Πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα.] I have already before ſaid, that by *weak and poor Elements* is meant the Jewiſh Law, and that is clear from this and the following Verſe. But there are two things which I ſhall here a little more particularly enquire into, *firſt*, why the Moſaical Precepts are called *weak and poor*; *ſecondly*, how the *Galatians* who had worſhipped falſe Gods, are ſaid *to return to* thoſe weak Elements.

The Elements of any Diſcipline relating to good Manners and divine Worſhip, ſuch as is the diſcipline of *Moſes*, cannot be ſtiled *weak* in any other ſenſe, than as they are not effectual to reform Mens Manners, or bring them to worſhip God in that manner as they ought to do. And indeed the Rewards and Puniſhments of the Jewiſh Law, which in a literal ſenſe were only temporal, could not have ſuch an influence upon the Minds of Men, as to bring them to any great degree of Vertue. For tho they might reſtrain them from committing thoſe Sins which would have render'd them infamous in the Eyes of others, or expoſed them to civil Puniſhments; yet they could not keep them from doing a great many things contrary to true Vertue; of which ſee *Mat.* v. and what is ſaid by *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* on that Chapter. In this ſenſe therefore the Law was ἀσθενὲς *weak*, that is, ineffectual and uncapable of making Men truly Pious and Vertuous. See alſo *Rom.* viii. 3. with the ſame learned Mens Notes.

Again, any Inſtitution may be called πτωχὸς, in a metaphorical ſenſe, when it is imperfect in its kind, and a great many things are wanting in it which muſt be made up and ſupplied out of another: as πτωχοὶ ἀνθρωποι are Men deſtitute of the neceſſary ſupports of Life, and who unleſs relieved by the liberality of others, are unable to ſubſiſt. And ſuch an Inſtitution is the Law, which unleſs it be perfected by the Goſpel, cannot bring Men to ſuch a degree of Piety as to make them acceptable to God, and worthy of eternal Life; as manifeſtly appears both from the nature of the thing it ſelf, and a great deal ſaid by Chriſt to that purpoſe in the fifth *Chapter* of St. *Matthew*. And this may poſſibly be the reaſon why St. *Paul* here uſes the word πτωχὰ rather than ἀσθενῆ *imperfect*, to intimate by a word of a ſpecial *Emphaſis*, that the Law of *Moſes* was not only in a few things but exceeding poor and defective. For πτωχὸς does not only ſignify *poor*, but poor to

Chapter IV.

a degree of *Beggery*. And therefore the Greeks distinguish πτωχεία from πενία, & πτωχὸς from πένης. *Poverty* or Πενία, in *Aristophanes* in *Pluto*, in an elegant disputation, wherein he endeavours to shew that Poverty is advantageous to Men, after *Chremylus* had described the inconveniences of Beggery, is brought in speaking thus:

Σὺ μὲ ὁ τὴν ἀνὸν βίον εἰρηκὼς, τὸν πτωχὸν δ' ἀπεκρύσω.

Tou have not been speaking of my Life, but declaring that of Beggers. On which words the Scholiast makes this observation: ἡ μὲ πενία μεσοτροπίαν ἐστὶν ἕξις, πόρῳ τὰ χρειώδη ἐκ τοῦ πένεσθαι, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐργάζεσθαι, εἴρηται, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πλείονα τὰ χρειώδη· ὁ δὲ πτωχὸς παρὰ τὸ πτώσσειν πάντας: *The word* πενία *signifies a middle sort of indigence, when a Man acquires necessaries by Labour; and comes from the Verb* πένεσθαι, *that is, to labour, and by that to acquire Necessaries: but a* πτωχὸς *is so called from his begging of every Body.* See also the following words of *Chremylus* and *Poverty*. But I dare not insist too much upon the significancy of this word in St. *Paul*, who does not use to be very critical in the choice of his words.

Further, the *Galatians* who *when they knew not God, did service unto them which by nature are not Gods*, are said here by St. *Paul*, upon their defection to *Judaism*, to have turned *to the weak and beggarly Elements, whereunto they desired again to be in bondage*; because, as I have already suggested, they had gone over from *Heathenism* to *Judaism*, before they became Christians. There is no doubt but many of those who first believed the Gospel among the *Gentiles*, were before σεβόμενοι, or *Proselytes of the Gate*, as the *Rabbins* speak, or also *of Righteousness*. Of the former sort were *Cornelius* the Centurion, spoken of in *Acts* x. and *Lydia* in *Acts* xvi. And there is no reason to think but the greatest part of the *Galatian* Christians were such Men, who certainly might much more easily relapse to *Judaism*, than embrace it if they had not before known it after their Conversion to the Christian Religion. I remark this, because *Grotius*, who on *vers.* 5. had observed that St. *Paul* spake of *Proselytes*, unmindful of what he had there affirmed, tells us that the *Galatians* are said here to return to the *elements of Piety*; *non quod Judaizassent antea, sed quia multa usurpassent cum Judæis communia, ut ciborum delectum, dierum discrimina*, &c. *Not because they had judaized before, but because* (whilst they were Heathens) *they had a great many Customs common to them with the* Jews, *as the distinction of Meats, and Days*, &c. But that he is mistaken is evident, because it is the Jewish Law that was before called *the Elements of the World*, on which words he has an excellent Annotation;

tation; and becauſe the following Verſe here clearly ſhews that they are ſaid to return to the Jewiſh Ceremonies; not to ſay how manifeſt that is from the whole ſeries of St. *Paul*'s diſputation in this place. Beſides, the Religion of the Heathens cannot be ſaid to contain *the elements of Piety*, which taught the moſt conſummate wickedneſs. So that St. *Paul* would rather have ſaid that they returned εἰς ἀσέβειαν, if what *Grotius* here ſays were true. And therefore we muſt underſtand him to ſpeak of the Moſaical Rites, which the *Galatians*, who were once Jewiſh Proſelytes, before they had embraced Chriſtianity, had in part at leaſt obſerved. Chapter IV.

Verſ. 12. Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς.] I don't know which to chuſe, Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretation of theſe words, or *Grotius* his, who makes them to be a Deſcription of St. *Paul*'s extraordinary affection to the *Galatians*. The place in *Cicero*, which *Grotius* refers to, is in Ep. *ad Famil.* Lib. 7. Ep. 5. to which add this Diſtich out of the Epigram of *Zeno*, the founder of the Sect of the Stoicks, which *Apuleius* ſets down in his Apology:

Hoc modo ſim vobis unus ſibi quiſque quod ipſe eſt.
Hoc mihi vos eritis quod duo ſunt oculi.

Verſ. 15. Τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρισμός, &c.] I cannot ſee what reaſon moved our Author in his Paraphraſe of this and the following Verſes, to make mention of *Perſecution*, whereof there is no footſtep in St. *Paul*'s words. He is as much out of the way too in ſeeking here for his *Gnoſticks*, and the Authority of the *Jews*, out of their own Country.

Verſ. 21. Τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;] That is, do not ye underſtand the Law, or do ye not hearken to it attentively when it is read to you? It deſerved here to be noted, that St. *Paul* argues from ſome received מדרש *midraſch* vulgarly known: For if that Allegory, whereof he here ſpeaks, had not been before heard of, he would have had no reaſon to wonder that the *Galatians* had never collected any ſuch thing from the Story which he refers to; it being not at all neceſſary that the words of Scripture ſhould have any ſuch allegorical ſignification as that is, ſuppoſed to belong to them. And therefore undoubtedly it was a known Allegory, tho perhaps ſomewhat otherwiſe expreſſed by the *Jews*.

Further; ſeeing this Interpretation could not be urged againſt thoſe, who might deny that the Scripture ought to be ſo underſtood, and the Apoſtle does not make uſe of his Authority to confirm it, it is evident that he argues here from what was generally allowed. Which

Chapter IV. kind of things it is not material ſhould be true or well grounded, as long as they contain nothing in them prejudical to Piety, and are believed by thoſe againſt whom we diſpute. So that from St. *Paul*'s uſing ſuch an Allegory againſt the Judaizing *Galatians*, it does not follow that we in this Age are bound to admit it, as a ſecret revealed from Heaven to the Apoſtle. For if we throughly conſider it, we ſhall find that moſt which has ever been ſaid by learned Men againſt this way of interpreting Scripture in general, may be objected againſt this particular Allegory.

Verſ. 24. *Note* b. Ἀλληγορέμενα is not a Participle in the *Middle* voice, as every one knows, and as Dr. *Hammond* himſelf very well knew, tho he ſaid otherwiſe before he was aware. It is to be taken in a Paſſive ſenſe, and rendred thus: which things *are allegorically explained*, or uſe to be ſo explained, that is, by a myſtical Interpretation applied to ſignify other things beſides thoſe which that Hiſtory literally contains.

This kind of Allegories muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Allegories of *Homer* and other Poets: For the Greek Grammarians, and eſpecially their Philoſophers, affirmed that a great many things which were ſaid by their Poets about the Gods, were falſe in a proper ſenſe, and never really happened; but in another obſtruſe and ſecret ſenſe were true. Whereas the *Jews* did not deny but that their Hiſtories were true, but from real events deduced Conſectaries belonging to other matters, as if thoſe events had been as ſo many repreſentations of other things. *Heraclides Ponticus* in his little Treatiſe *de Allegoriis Homericis*, gives us this true definition of a Poetical Allegory; ἀλλὰ μὲ ἀλληγορίαν τρόπος, ὅταν ἕτερα μὲν λέγῃ σημαίνων, ἑτέρων δὲ ἀλληγορία καλεῖται: *A Trope wherein one thing* (ἀλληγορέται) *is ſaid, and another thing different from that ſignified, is called an Allegory.*

Verſ. 25. *Note* c. Our learned Author has ſufficiently indeed here ſhewn that the *Arabians* were circumciſed, but not in conformity to the *Moſaical* Law, but a more antient Precept given to *Abraham* himſelf; and in imitation of *Iſmael*, not of *Iſaac*. Whether they had any other Cuſtom which might be look'd upon as an imitation of the Law of *Moſes* I cannot tell; but it is falſe that the *Iſmaelites* ever bound themſelves to obſerve the Moſaical Ceremonies, as was obſerved by *Grotius*, whom I wonder Dr. *Hammond* did not give ear to. I have often obſerved that learned Men ſupply out of their own Invention what is wanting in the Teſtimonies of the Antients; and afterwards thence draw Concluſions, as grounded upon the undoubted Authority of Antient Writers; which yet is certainly no good way of arguing.

The

The 24th and two following Verſes, may be thus paraphraſed: Chapter IV.

Ver. 24. "These things uſe to be allegorically explained by the *Jews*, "and may be interpreted ſo as to ſignify what I a little before ſaid. "*Sarah* and *Hagar* are as it were the Symbols of two Covenants; "the latter, viz. *Hagar*, of the Covenant given from Mount *Sinai*, "the Laws of which impoſe nothing but Slavery upon thoſe who ſeek "to be juſtified by it. 25. (And *Hagar* is ſo much the more fitly "ſaid to be an emblem of the Covenant delivered from Mount *Sinai*, "becauſe her name ſignifies a *Rock*.) And to that Covenant, of which "the Servantmaid *Hagar* was an Image, belongs the earthly *Jeruſa-* "*lem*, which is entirely taken up in the obſervation of ſervil Rites, "and acted by a ſlaviſh Fear. 26. But *Sarah* the free Woman is a "Symbol of the Evangelical Covenant, according to the Laws of "which the Citizens of the Spiritual *Jeruſalem* live, that is, all we "Chriſtians.

The Apoſtle undoubtedly alludes to the name of *Hagar*, which being written with an ח, according to the uſual confuſion of the guttural Letters, חגר *hhagar*, ſignifies a *Rock* among the *Arabians*. It is probable that the *Jews*, who were no very great Friends to the *Arabians*, ſaid a great many things *by way of Allegory* out of the Hiſtory of *Moſes*, to extol their Nation, and on the contrary to depreſs the *Hagarens*; and that St. *Paul* here applies to thoſe who were *Iſraelites* according to the *Spirit*, what the *Jews* uſed to ſay in honour of their Nation; as on the contrary to the *carnal Jews*, what they often aſſerted to the diſadvantage of the *Hagarens*.

I ſhall take the liberty here, which I do not otherwiſe uſe, to *allegorize* a little after the *Jewiſh* manner, that we may the better ſee what might give the Apoſtle *Paul* an occaſion to ſpeak ſo as he does. And firſt I ſhall perform the part of a Jewiſh דרשן *darſchan*, or Allegorical Preacher; and then repreſent a Chriſtian retorting the like Allegory upon the Jew.

THE JEWISH דרשן

That ye may be ſenſible, O *Iſraelites*, of the great benefits which God has conferred upon you, compare your Original with that of your Neighbours the *Hagarens*. The founder of your Nation *Iſaac* was born of a *free* Woman and Miſtreſs of a Family, *Sarah*; on the contrary, *Iſmael* the Father and Founder of the *Hagarens*, was born of a *Servant*. *Iſaac* was conceived by a particular efficacy of the Divine Power, when *Abraham* was neither able to beget, nor *Sarah* to conceive, by reaſon

Chapter IV.

of old Age; on the other hand, *Iſmael* was born of *Abraham* and *Hagar* when younger, according to the ordinary courſe of Nature. Nor did the diſtinguiſhing Providence of God terminate only on *Sarah* and *Hagar*, and their Sons *Iſaac* and *Iſmael*; but drew as it were in them the figure of what has already come to paſs in former Ages, and ſhall hereafter happen to both their Progenies. The Poſterity of *Iſaac* have been protected almoſt with perpetual Miracles, and often enjoyed the ſweets of Liberty, and had dominion over their neighbour Nations, and ſhall again have, when that great King whom we ſo much expect and long for, and whoſe Reign our antient Prophecies foretel, comes to rule over us. But the *Hagarens*, like their Mother, caſt out and diſinherited, have already more than once been our Servants, and ſhall hereafter be ſo, being ſubdued by the Power and Authority of the *Meſſias*. Do not in the leaſt doubt of the truth of what I ſay, for God has heretofore given you a pledg of future events, on one hand in *Sarah* and *Iſaac*, and on the other in *Hagar* and *Iſmael*, who, as I ſaid before, repreſented the ſeveral Conditions of their poſterity.

THE CHRISTIAN ALLEGORIST.

We take you at your word, O *Jews*, that antient Events did ſhadow out and repreſent things future. But as of old the Offspring of *Abraham* was twofold, ſo it is now; and the ſame which was the condition of that twofold race of *Abraham*, is at preſent the lot of their Poſterity. *Hagar* and *Iſmael* were Images of the *Carnal Iſraelites*, who are the Seed of *Abraham* indeed according to the Fleſh; but becauſe they do not imitate his Faith and Piety, ſhall not inherit the Promiſes made to him upon believing. They ſhall be caſt out of his ſpiritual Family, and be ſubject in a ſervil manner to the Covenant eſtabliſhed on Mount *Sinai* in *Arabia*; of which *Hagar* may the more fitly be ſaid to be an Emblem, becauſe her name ſignifies a *Rock*, and her Poſterity ſtill inhabit that Country. So that the Bondwoman *Hagar*, who was caſt out together with her Son, repreſented the ſtate of the earthly *Jeruſalem*, which is ſubject to ſlaviſh Rites and Ceremonies. But *Sarah* the Freewoman, of whom *Iſaac* was heretofore born beſide the courſe of Nature, in like manner as now Men are made Chriſtians by an extraordinary efficacy of the Divine Power, was an Image of the Evangelical Covenant, and the *Jeruſalem* which was to come, that is, the Chriſtian Church. As *Sarah* and *Iſaac* were Free, ſo alſo Chriſtians freely obey God, and are not tied to any ſervil

vil Rites. As *Iſaac* only was *Abraham*'s Heir, ſo none but Chriſtians ſhall obtain that heavenly Inheritance which *Abraham* by his Faith obtained. Chapter V.

If the *Jews* thought their reaſoning againſt the *Arabians* to be cogent, there was no reaſon why they ſhould reject the Chriſtian Allegory. And this I doubt not made St. *Paul* here uſe an allegorical way of reaſoning, which he otherwiſe would not have done.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 6. *Note* b. I. SEEING our Author has thought fit to put together in this place all he had to obſerve about the word ἐνεργεῖσθαι, I ſhall examine all that he ſays; for there are ſome things in it which I cannot aſſent to. I grant the Verb ἐνεργεῖσθαι may, according to the Analogy of Grammar, be taken as well in a *Paſſive* as an *Active* ſenſe, as the matter requires; but I do not think it is ſo uſed in all the places here alledged. In *Rom.* vii. 5. ἐνεργεῖτο ſignifies *actively*, and the whole paſſage is rightly rendred, *the affections of Sins which were by the Law*, wrought *in our Members*, not *were conſummated* or *perfected* in them; for ἐνεργεῖν has never that ſignification, nor do the places alledged out of the Apoſtle *James*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* prove it, as we ſhall preſently ſee. The ſecond place is 2 *Cor.* i. 6. which may receive indeed a Paſſive ſignification, if we read σωτηρίας τῆς ἐνεργουμένης, with *the Vulgar* Interpreter and other Copies. And the ſame may be ſaid of 2 *Cor.* iv. 12. But in *Epheſ.* iii. 20. and *Col.* i. 29. the Participle ἐνεργουμένη muſt in all reaſon be underſtood *actively*, for the diſcourſe there is about the *power* of God which is not *wrought* but *works*. In 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 13. ἐνεργεῖται cannot be rendred *obtains its end*, by any who underſtand Greek, or conſider carefully what they ſay. But in 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 7. it may well enough be interpreted in a Paſſive ſenſe. In this place δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη is beſt of all rendred *working by Love*, that is, which performs works of Love.

II. Tho St. *James* ſays that ἐξ ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη *Faith was made perfect by Works*, it does not follow that ἐνεργουμένη ſignifies all one with τελειουμένη *made perfect*; for why may not St. *James* ſay ſomething different from that which is ſaid by St. *Paul*? How did Dr. *Hammond* know that St. *James* performs the part of St. *Paul*'s Interpreter? Beſides, granting theſe two Paſſages in both the Apoſtles to be parallel, it will not thence follow that exactly the ſame thing is ſaid in both; ſo that the Verb made uſe of by St. *Paul*, may grammatically be interpreted by

Chapter III.

that which is used by St. *James*. Nor will the Etymology or perpetual use of the word ἐνεργεῖσθαι suffer it to be rendred, *made perfect*.

III. The place referred to in *Clemens Alexandrinus* is in *Strom.* Lib. iv. Pag. 518, & 519. *Ed. Paris. & Colon.* but is not here pertinently alledged, as will appear by his words, which I shall therefore set down entire. He is speaking in praise of Love, out of *Clemens Romanus*, and among other things says thus: ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ: *in Love have all the Elect of God been made perfect.* And a little after: εἰ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθῆναί τινες χρὴ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν, ἔχωμεν χάριν δικαίων: *those who are perfected in Love, according to the Grace of God, obtain the place of Pious Men.* And underneath he says: ἀγάπη γὰρ τὸ μὴ μοιχεύσαι ἢ τὸ μὴ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἢ τὸ πλησίον τελεῖται, φόβῳ ἀφέσεως κεκαλυμένον· τί οὖν γὰρ ἕτερον διαφορὰν ἔχῃ, ἢ διὰ φόβον γινόμενον, ἢ δι' ἀγάπην τελειόν, ἢ ὅτι διὰ πίστεως, ἢ καὶ γνώσεως ἐνεργεῖται; *Love therefore makes us not to commit Adultery, and not to covet what is our Neighbours, which before we were restrained from by fear. So that there is a difference in the same action, as it is either done out of Fear, or wrought in Love; or as it is performed only out of Faith, or also from Knowledg.* In this place τελειὸν is no more than πραθὲν *done* or *wrought*, as its synonimous words ἐνεργούμενον & γινόμενον, and the thing it self shew. So that it cannot hence be inferred that ἐνεργεῖσθαι is the same with *to be consummated* or *made perfect*, in French *être perfectionné*. Besides, τελειωθεὶς δι' ἀγάπης before, signifies another thing, where the Discourse is about Persons, not about Actions.

IV. In *James* v. 16. δέησις ἐνεργουμένη seems to signify *an earnest Prayer.* Of the word ἐνεργουμένη, being taken in a good sense, add to what the *Doctor* says, the observations of *Budæus* and *Henr. Stephanus*, who have done the World a great deal of Service in the pains they have taken about the Greek Language.

V. The words of *Hesychius* are much worse corrupted by our Author, than they are in the common Editions. If he had looked into *Phavorinus*, perhaps he would have understood how they were to be corrected. That Grammarian has out of *Hesychius*, Ἐνεργοί, ἕτοιμοι πρὸς ἐργασίαν, ἢ ἐνεργούμενοι, αἱ μὴ ἀργαὶ, εἰσακουόμεναι, τελούμεναι. But it must be read: ΕΝΕΡΓΟΙ, ἕτοιμοι πρὸς ἐργασίαν, ἢ ἐνεργούμενοι, *prepared to work, or working.* ΕΝΕΡΓΟΥΜΕΝΑΙ, αἱ μὴ ἀργαὶ, εἰσακουόμεναι, τελούμεναι, *not vain, heard, perfected*, or *fulfilled*, viz. εὐχαὶ, *Prayers*; *Hesychius* having a respect to the forementioned Passage in the Apostle *James*. So that it's true there was here a void space, or *Lacuna*, but different from what Dr. *Hammond* thought. The *Scribe*, whoever he was, omitted the word ἐνεργούμεναι because of the next following, which differs only from

from that, in having the Letter A inſtead of O. Such Omiſſions are frequent in the Writings of the Antients, proceeding from the ſame Cauſe, as I have ſhewn in my *Ars Critica*, Part 3. Sect. i. Cap. 5. and it is needleſs to add any thing more about this particular corruption in *Heſychius*. Chapter V.

Verſ. 12. *Note* c. Ὄφελον ſignifying *utinam*, *I wiſh*, is always joined with an *Infinitive*, *Optative* or *Subjunctive* Mood or Preterperfect Tenſe, never with a Future, nor is the Particle ἄν ever interpoſed. See *Thomas Magiſter* on that Particle. And therefore I ſhould underſtand Ὄφελον here as if it were Ὤφελον, if not alſo read it ſo, to this ſenſe: *They ought* to have been cut off, and *ſhall* actually *be cut off*, when I come among you, *that trouble you*; and ſo it will be an *Elliptical* phraſe, for this entire one: ὤφελον ἀποκόπτεσθαι, ἢ ὄντως ἀποκόψονται; Such another as that in theſe Verſes of *Virgil* in *Catalectis*, after the Verb *debuit*:

——— quæ maxima deterrendi
Debuit, audendi maxima cauſa fuit.

Where out of what follows we muſt ſupply, *cauſa eſſe*, as here ἀποκόπτεσθαι. Or elſe we muſt underſtand ζημίαν, *Mulct*, *Loſs* or *Puniſhment*, which often uſe to be underſtood after the Verb ὄφελον; whence it comes to paſs that ὄφελον is taken ſimply for *he was condemned*, becauſe condemned Perſons *ought* to ſuffer *Loſs* or *Puniſhment*. As in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus* Lib. ix. Ant. Rom. *pag.* 585. ſpeaking of *Menenius* who was accuſed by the Tribunes of the People: δικάζοντες τῷ δημοτικῷ ὄχλῳ κατ' φυλάς, ὀλίγαις ψήφοις, ὤφελε: *the People giving Sentence by Tribes, by no ſmall number of Votes, he was condemned.* It is all one which of theſe ways we interpret the word ὄφελον. It might be confounded with ὤφελον, of which it is really made, by taking away the augment, unleſs it be thought rather to come from ὀφέλλω, which often ſignifies the ſame with ὀφείλω; or elſe the Tranſcribers might eaſily change ὤφελον into ὄφελον. St. *Jerom*'s interpretation of this place, which *Grotius* follows, is intolerable, *utinam abſcindatur*, *ipſum membrum genitale*. Such an imprecation would have been fitter for a lewd Buffoon than for St. *Paul*. And Dr. *Hammond*'s laſt conjecture leſſens the Apoſtle another way, becauſe it repreſents him as diffident of his Authority among the *Galatians*, notwithſtanding it was ſupported by ſo many Miracles; which cannot reaſonably be thought. Beſides, as I before ſaid, they are both contrary to the Rules of Grammar.

Verſ. 14. Πᾶς νόμος.] That is, all in the Law that relates to our Neighbour; againſt which part of it thoſe who offended their Neighbour

Chapter VI. bour by their Liberty in not obſerving the Law, might ſin, tho not againſt God.

Verſ. 20. *Note* d. I. Tho *Simon* and *Menander* were Magicians, it does not follow that *they* are here referred to; for there might be other Impoſtors beſides them. Perhaps too φαρμακείας may here ſignify *Sorceries* or *Witchcrafts*, rather than Magical Arts properly ſo called.

II. The place in *Euſebius*, or rather in *Irenæus*, was not ſufficiently underſtood by our Author, as appears by his making ἀδέκατοι αἰῶνες to be the ſame with the ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοί, which are to be diſtinguiſhed. For *Menander* would have had it believed that he was ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγνοίας πυθεν ἐξ ἀοράτων αἰώνων ἀπεσταλμένος σωτηρία: *ſent from ſome ſuperior place and inviſible Æones for Mens Salvation*, to overcome the Ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοί.

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. OUR Author ſeems here to ſuppoſe that none were privileged with extraordinary Gifts, but the Officers or Governours of the Church, otherwiſe there is no reaſon why *they* ſhould be called *Spiritual* rather than others. For as to the *Duty* here ſpoken of by the Apoſtle, it may belong to any Chriſtian, who ought to endeavour by Admonition to reduce his wandring Brother into the right way, and that by a gentle way of Admonition, or *in the Spirit of Meekneſs*. See *Rom.* xv. 1.

Verſ. 2. Τὰ βάρη.] I don't believe that the Apoſtle here alludes to a *Building*, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks in his Paraphraſe, but to Men travelling together *loaded*, of which thoſe who have the lighteſt Burden, help ſuch as are overcharged, by taking from them part of their Load. By *Burdens* here are meant thoſe Difficulties and Temptations which beſet Chriſtians in this World, and endanger their falling into Sin. And ſo we are ſaid to *bear one anothers Burdens*, when we mutually aſſiſt each other in thoſe difficulties, to prevent our being ſurprized by them into Sin: See *Mat.* xx. 12. where βάρος καὶ καύσωνα, ſignifies to have laboured all the day.

Verſ. 3. Εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι.] I do not ſee why this may not be meant of *any* proud conceited Perſons, who deſpiſe their Neighbour, and will not vouchſafe to aſſiſt him; that it ſhould be neceſſary to recur to the *Gnoſticks*, as our Author does in his Paraphraſe.

Verſ. 12. Μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διώκωνται.] *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* would have St. *Paul* here to ſpeak of a Perſecution that was to be feared from the *Jews*, in which I cannot agree with them for the reaſons

reaſons alledged at the end of the *Premonition* to this *Epiſtle*. All the danger was from the *Romans*, whom they needed not to fear if they declared themſelves to be circumciſed, becauſe the *Jewiſh* Religion was tolerated by the *Romans*; and for that reaſon thoſe here ſpoken of ſtrove to impoſe the Moſaical Yoke, which they themſelves bore, upon the uncircumciſed *Gentiles*, to ſave them, together with themſelves, from the Roman Perſecution. Chapter VI.

Verſ. 13. Οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι.] Theſe words make it highly probable that the Perſons here ſpoken of were circumciſed; otherwiſe they would not agree to this place. For I cannot ſee with what face or proſpect any number of Men could attempt to force others to become circumciſed, if they themſelves had not received Circumciſion. It is very unlikely that the Heathen Magiſtrates and *Jews* would ſuffer themſelves to be ſo impoſed upon, as to take uncircumciſed Perſons for *Jews*; nor could their perſwaſions have any influence upon the *Gentiles*, if they did not obſerve themſelves what they exacted from others.

Ibid. Ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται.] That they may boaſt of their bringing you to ſubmit to Circumciſion, becauſe they are *Jews*, and ſo would be hugely pleaſed to ſee all the *Gentiles* ſubject to their Laws. The phraſe ἐν σαρκὶ is all one with ἐν σαρκικῇ περιτομῇ, *in fleſhly Circumciſion*. I am not of our Author's Opinion, that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the *Gnoſticks*.

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Epheſians*.

AT the end of the *Præmon.*] This Epiſtle is with more probability referred by Dr. *Pearſon* to the Year of *Chriſt* lxii. or the ninth of *Nero*. The ſame learned Man proves that what our Author mentions in this Premonition, about *Timothy*'s being left at *Epheſus*, happened in the Year of *Chriſt* lxiv. Conſult himſelf.

Inſtead of the ſingle Sect of the *Gnoſticks*, which our Author thinks St. *Paul* oppoſes in this Epiſtle, *Grotius* with much more reaſon ſuppoſes that the Apoſtle inveighs againſt the *Heathens* and *Jews*. For it is certain there were *Jews* and *Heathen* Philoſophers almoſt every where at that time, but it is not ſo clear that the followers of *Simon* were diſperſed in all places.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. WHAT is here ſaid by our learned Author is true, but the thing muſt be proved a little more *Grammatically*. *To chooſe* properly is out of many things propoſed to us to prefer one thing before the reſt, which we may make uſe of to a certain end, rather than any other. Upon which follows the execution of that preference, whereby we do what we had before purpoſed, and which is alſo ſometimes called *chooſing*. In this latter ſenſe God did not chooſe us *before the foundation of the World*; but in the former only, wherein he *purpoſed* to call thoſe Nations whom he afterwards called actually to the knowledg of the Goſpel, by *Chriſt Jeſus*. And ſo ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, is all one as if St. *Paul* had ſaid: before the World was made he preferred us before other People, as thoſe whom he intended by Chriſt and his Apoſtles (that being very fitly attributed to *Chriſt*, which is done by his Apoſtles in his

his Name) to call, &c. That ἐν Χριστῷ is the ſame with διὰ Χριστοῦ appears by the Verſe following; and nothing is more common in theſe Books than that Hebraiſm of *in* for *by*. See *Chap.* ii. 14, 15. and iii. 6. Chapter II.

Hence the execution of that preference is ſometimes ſignified by the ſame word as the Decree it ſelf: As we may ſee by *Clemens Romanus* in Epiſt. i. to the *Corinthians*, chap. l. Οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: *This bleſſedneſs came upon thoſe that were choſen by God through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* And the ſame Writer in *Chap.* lvii. ſaith: Ὁ παντεπόπτης Θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ κύριος πάσης σαρκός, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ λαὸν περιούσιον: *God the overſeer of all things, and ſoveraign of Spirits, and Lord of all Fleſh, who has choſen Jeſus Chriſt, and us by him, for a peculiar People.*

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 3. Ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς.] I cannot ſee why Dr. *Hammond* choſe rather here to follow other Interpreters than *Grotius*, who with good reaſon thought that St. *Paul* in this place ſpeaks of the *Jews*; eſpecially ſeeing he himſelf thought that the ſame word ought to be ſo taken in *Chap.* i. 11. of this *Epiſtle*, as appears by his Paraphraſe. For St. *Paul* did not write this Epiſtle in the name of the Church of *Rome*; ſo that when he ſays ἡμεῖς, he ſhould be underſtood to ſpeak of the Chriſtians who dwelt in that City. And beſides, nothing could be ſaid more flat in the name of the Roman *Gentiles* than, *among whom alſo we all had our Converſation*, &c. ſeeing every body knew that the *Romans* had lived in the ſame Vices with other Heathens, yea had been worſe it may be than their Neighbours, as the Inhabitants of great Cities are generally moſt devoted to the Vices of the Age. But that might very fitly be ſaid of the *Jews*, whom St. *Paul* would otherwiſe have ſeemed to diſtinguiſh from other Nations, as to the courſe of their Lives; in which as he would not have declared the truth, ſo he might have offended the *Gentiles*. And for this reaſon he ſays here, *we all*, that is, *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*.

Ibid. Τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς.] The meaning of this expreſſion I have ſhewn at large in my *Ars Critica* Part 2. Sect. i. cap. 7. to be no more than this; that the *Jews* were a People of as wicked Diſpoſitions, and deſerved as much the Wrath of God as other Nations.

Verſ. 10. Αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.] I have ſet down the whole

Chapter II. Verſe to ſhew that the ſenſe of the laſt words is different from what is vulgarly thought. They render ὃις προητοίμασεν, by *quæ præparavit*, *which he hath prepared*, and I do not deny but that according to the Greek Conſtruction it may be ſo rendred; but the thing it ſelf, and the Phraſe, ought to have admoniſhed Interpreters that ἡμᾶς was rather to be underſtood, and that it ſhould be rendred *for which he hath prepared us* or *made us fit*. The foregoing words, in which Chriſtians are called *God's workmanſhip*, and ſaid to be *created by Chriſt*, ſhew that St. *Paul* ſpeaks of a change made in Men, who of bad and indiſpoſed to good Works, were made good and fit for the exerciſe of Chriſtian Vertues. And therefore the Verb προητοιμάζειν ſhould have been referred to *them*. It's certain κτίζειν ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, is the ſame with προητοιμάζειν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.

There can ſcarce be a harſher Phraſe, and more deſtitute of examples than this, *to prepare good Works that* Men *might walk in them*. But *Men* themſelves are frequently ſaid ἑτοιμάζεσθαι & προητοιμάζεσθαι. So in *Rom.* ix. 23. where St. *Paul* ſpeaks of a like matter, God is ſaid *to make known the riches of his Glory on the veſſels of Mercy, which he had before prepared, εἰς δόξαν, to Glory; whom he alſo hath called, not only us of the* Jews, *but alſo of the* Gentiles. God is here ſaid προητοιμάσαι *to have prepared* us to good Works, becauſe the knowledg and belief of the Goſpel has that influence upon us as to fit us for the performance of vertuous Actions. So in the Book of the Son of *Sirach* Chap. ii. 1. all that intend to ſerve God are exhorted ἑτοίμασον ψυχήν σου εἰς πειρασμόν *to prepare their Souls for Temptation*. See *verſ.* 18. of the ſame *Chapter*, and *Chap.* xvii. 25.

Verſ. 14. *Note* a. The place in *Eccleſiaſticus* is nothing to this buſineſs, which perhaps our Author did not look into, in the Book it ſelf, becauſe he quotes it wrong out of *Chap.* xix. 29. whereas it is in *Chap.* xxix. 30. and πρόσωπον δόξης ſignifies *an honorable Man*, and the diſcourſe there is about another thing. Nor was the ſtranger commanded *to go out* of the Sanctuary of *Iſrael*, but forbidden to *enter into* it.

Verſ. 15. Ἐν ἑαυτῷ] Here our Author tells us in the Margin that the *Kings Manuſcript* reads ἐν αὐτῷ, which he renders *together*; but to expreſs that, St. *Paul* ſhould have ſaid εἰς ἓ ἄνθρωπον.

Verſ. 19. *Note* b. It is truly obſerved by Dr. *Hammond* that ἅγιοι here refers to the *Jews*, but there was no neceſſity of recurring to *Procopius* for the reaſon of their being ſo called. The *Jews* are ſtiled קדושים *Saints*, becauſe they were conſecrated to the true God, and not becauſe their Forefathers were holy in their Lives. See *Exod.* xix. 6. and my Notes on that place.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 5. Ὃ ΕΝ ἑτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, &c.] The ſame thing which is here ſaid *in other Ages not to have been made known to the Sons of Men*, is ſaid in *verſ.* 10. to have been unknown alſo to *Angels*. Which being ſo, I confeſs I do not well underſtand how thoſe who are neither Prophets nor Angels, can find out ſo many places in the Prophets, in which the calling of the *Gentiles* is manifeſtly and directly foretold. For certainly if it was of old revealed to the Prophets, they underſtood it; for that which is not underſtood cannot be thought revealed. And if it could have been gathered from the literal ſenſe of any Prophecies, the Angels might have underſtood it by thoſe Prophecies. But the event, you will ſay, which is the beſt Interpreter of Prophecies, has unfolded the ſenſe of them. But I demand whether ſuch an event can be eaſily ſuppoſed to be reſpected in Prophecies, which are ſo obſcure, that neither Men nor Angels could before underſtand them to contain any ſuch ſenſe? If that can be ſuppoſed, I do not ſee what event may not be found in them. But, you will ſay again, the Apoſtles, and ſo the Angels, came to know that they had a reſpect to ſuch an event by divine Revelation. But, as I ſaid before, that cannot be called a Revelation which no body underſtands, and therefore it was of no uſe to the Prophets: See what has been alledged out of the learned *H. Dodwell* on *Mat.* ii. 2. From hence all that I here infer is, that we ought not preſently to condemn thoſe who look for *other* events, which happen'd before *Chriſt* in the antient Prophecies, of which number the great *Grotius* muſt be reckon'd the chief: otherwiſe this matter would deſerve to be more exactly diſcuſſed.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 8. Ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν.] It is a conjecture of a Friend of mine, that by Captivity here is meant the dead bodies of Saints, which were held captive by Death, but were raiſed with Chriſt at his Reſurrection, and aſcended with him into Heaven, *Mat.* xxvii. And accordingly he thought that St. *Paul* ſays, Chriſt *deſcended into the lower parts of the Earth*, becauſe he deſcended into the Grave, that he might bring them out from thence. And there is nothing in the thing it ſelf, nor in the words repugnant to this Interpretation.

Chapter IV.

Ibid. *Note* a. I. *Marcus Aurelius* gave nothing to the common People of *Rome* in the time of Triumph, nor any thing of his own accord. The ſtory is thus related by *Xiphilinus* out of *Dio*: Πρὸς δὲ δῆμον διαλεγόμενος, ἐπειδὴν μάτην λέγειν ἔφη τὰ τε ἄλλα, καὶ ὅτι πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἀπεδεδημηκὼς ἦν, ἀνεβόησαν, ὀκτώ· καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν, ἵνα δὴ καὶ χρυσοῦς τοσούτους εἰς τὸ δῆτον λαβεῖν, σεσημείωντο· διαμειδιάσας, καὶ ἔφη καὶ αὐτὸς, ὀκτώ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὖθις διακοσίας δραχμὰς αὐτοῖς κατένειμεν: *As he was making a ſpeech to the People, and ſaying among other things that he had been abroad many Years, they cryed out, Eight; and this they ſignified alſo with their Hands, that they might receive ſo many pieces of Gold. Upon which he ſmiled, and ſaid himſelf alſo Eight; and afterwards diſtributed among them two hundred Drachms.* It had been better therefore to have inſtanced in ſome other Triumph, which might eaſily have been done: See what is ſaid by *Suetonius* about the Gifts of *Julius Cæſar* upon that occaſion, in *Chap.* xxxviii. of his Life.

II. What our Author ſays here about the ſignification of the Verb לקח, he owes to Mr. *Pocock*; whoſe conjecture *that* is, in *Porta Moſis* Cap. ii. But when that Verb ſignifies to *give*, there follows a *Dative* caſe, becauſe *to receive for any one* is *to receive that we may give it to him*: See *Exod.* xviii. 12. and xxv. 2. But the Hebrew here has באדם *in Man*; which has made learned Men conjecture, and not without reaſon, that St. *Paul* read לאדם *laadam, to Man.*

Verſ. 14. *Note* c. Seeing κύβος properly ſignifies a ſquare Body, and ſecondarily a *Dye* becauſe of its figure; and ſeeing Impoſtours made uſe of *Dice* or *Lots* for divination, the word κυβεία here would not be ill rendred *ſortilegium, a Lottery* or *divination by Lots.* And this is what was meant by *Irenæus*, in the place alledged by the *Doctor*; for μαγικὴ κυβεία is *magical divination by Lots*, not *deceitful Artifices, ſuch as are uſed by Conjurers.* And tho the word πανουργία here follows, it is not therefore conſequent that κυβεία ſignifies the ſame with that, but only that they were often joined together. Conjectures about the meaning of words which are grounded neither upon their Etymology, nor their proper ſignification, nor uſe, are not to be much regarded, nothing being more uncertain.

Verſ. 16. *Note* e. I confeſs the Apoſtles words in this place are ſomewhat dark and intricate, but yet they did not need ſuch a laborious explication as this, whereby tho the ſubſtance of the matter be made clearer, yet the particulars are more obſcured. The *Doctor*, who never minded propriety of words in his Stile, or knew what it was to carry on one deſign with the ſame ſimple thred of Diſcourſe, confounds here every thing with his forced and perplexed reaſonings, and has no regard at all to the uſe of words.

I. His

I. His first question is altogether unnecessary and impertinent in this place, for St. *Paul* says nothing here about the Heart; nor is there any Metaphor taken from the Heart in his words. So that in explaining this Verse there can be no room for any enquiry about the Heart: tho the Heart be as it were the workhouse of the Blood, in which the vital Moisture is temper'd, and whence it is spread by a reciprocal flowing through the whole Body, St. *Paul* has no reference at all to that, but to the *effluvia* of the Brain, from which proceed Spirits, that help the motion of the Blood, and moisten the whole Body; and so the Body, which would otherwise wither and decay, is made to encrease. Chapter IV.

II. The words διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, must not be joined with those immediately going before, but with the Verb ποιεῖται, so as to signify those Conduits or Passages by which the Body receives Spirits from the Brain, thus: *from which* (Head) *the whole Body being fitly compacted and joined together, according to the working or efficacy* of the Head *in proportion to every part, maketh encrease of the Body*, i. e. is encreased by receiving Spirits from the Brain, *through the joints of supply*, or by which the Spirits are conveyed for the supply of the whole Body. It's certain the Body cannot be said to be συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον with Nerves, Arteries, and Veins; but rather with Muscles, Tendons, and Bones. But St. *Paul* says nothing of these, but only that the Body being fitly compacted and joined together, receiveth *effluvia* from its Head, by Conduits belonging to the whole Body; which therefore it would not receive if the Members were put out of Joint, or divided from one another, because those *effluvia* pass through the Joints or Ligaments of the Body. So that ἁφαὶ & σύνδεσμοι are the *Joints* and *Ligatures* of the Members properly so called, through which the Nerves pass, which convey the Spirits proceeding from the Brain to all the parts of the Body.

III. The place in the *Colossians* is wrested by our Author while he supposes it to be clear and undoubted that St. *Paul* has a respect there to Veins and Arteries, of which perhaps he had not the least thought. He speaks thus, after making mention of the Head: *from which all the Body*, διὰ τῆς ἁφῆς καὶ συνδέσμων, ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον, *increases with the increase of God*. Where by ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων the Apostle means the *Joints* and *Ligaments* of the Body, that is, the Muscles, Tendons and Gristles, which are in those places where the Members are joined together, to perform as it were two Offices; *first*, to receive the Conduits whereby the *effluvia* which proceed out of the Brain descend into the Body: *secondly*, to cement or knit together all the Members with one another. So that the Apostles meaning is this: From which

Chapter IV. Head the whole Body receives a divine Increaſe, by the Joints and Ligaments whereby thoſe Spirits are ſupplied, and by which the Members are joined together as by ſo many ſtrong Bands. This ſeems to me to be clear, eſpecially ſeeing every one knows that no Arteries deſcend from the Brain, but only Veins, by which the Blood is carried back to the Heart and Nerves, which are diſperſed through the whole Body.

IV. I cannot tell what made our Author think that the Genitive ἐπιχορηγίας was in the place of συνδέσμων, the only ſignification of that being, that the Joints are the ways by which the ἐπιχορηγία is made: as the Joints of Tubes which receive Water flowing into them out of ſome large Fountain, and convey it whereſoever they are directed, are the Joints of the ἐπιχορηγία of that Water.

V. Κατ' ἐνέργειαν muſt not be referred to the Conduits, through which the *effluvia* that proceed out of the Head do paſs, which Conduits ἐδὲν ἐνεργῶν *operate nothing*, but to the Head it ſelf, from which, to uſe the words of *Virgil* with a little alteration,

——————— *infuſa per artus*
Vis agitat molem, & toto ſe corpore miſcet.

So St. *Paul*, who was none of the extreme Members in the Body or Church of Chriſt, ſays that he *laboured, ſtriving according to his working*, κατ' ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ, *which he worked in him*, in *Coloſſ.* i. 29. See alſo *Chap.* i. 19. and iii. 7. of this Epiſtle.

VI. Σῶμα πεπῖται ἀυξησιν τῦ σώματος, is a noted *Hebraiſm*, in which σώματος is repeated for ἑαυτοῦ, as *Grotius* obſerves. What is ſaid by our Author is taken from the uſe of the *Rabbins*.

Verſ. 19. *Note* f. I. Who this *Pauſanias* is I cannot tell, but perhaps Dr. *Hammond* wrote *Phavorinus*, whom he often cites, and who has, ἀπολγήσαντες ἀπὸ τῦ πανσαμένης ἀλγεῖν, & ἀπολγῶντας ἢ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τῦ πολλῦ βίγος ἐπεφύκεσαν. To which places our Author refers, which *Suidas* alſo has out of *Thucydides* and *Polybius*.

II. But whereſoever Dr. *Hammond* had this, it is certainly falſe, for ἀλγέω never ſignifies *algere* in Latin, *to be cold*, nor ἄλγος *algor* cold, tho they reſemble one another in ſound. Ἀπολγέω is *to loſe ones feeling, to be no longer ſenſible of any Pain*, whatever be the cauſe of it. I confeſs it proceeds ſometimes from extremity of Cold, when the parts of the Body being congealed with the ſharpneſs of Air or the like, ceaſe to feel any Pain; but ἀπολγέω does not therefore ſignify *to ceaſe to feel cold*, but any ſort of Pain. So in *Heſychius*: Ἀπολγεκότες, μηκέτι δίλοντες

Chapter IV.

ἀλγοῦντες πονεῖν, ἀναίσθητοι γινόμενοι, ἀπηγμένοντες, *those that will no longer work, that are become insensible, that are tired.* Ἀπηγκωὶς, ἀναίσθητος, ὃς τὸ ἄλγος, *insensible, one that is past pain.* Besides, ἀλγέω always has a Passive signification, and never an Active. The thing is manifest and needs no proof, yet this is not the first time of our Author's mistaking the sense of this word. See Note on *Rom.* i. 29.

Vers. 26. *Note* h. I. I confess I do not see any allusion in the words of the Apostle to those three kinds of angry Persons mention'd here by our Author out of *Aristotle.* He teaches us that all excessive Anger is to be avoided, but he does not seem to refer to the distinction made by that Philosopher between the several degrees of Anger; at least there is no sign of it in his words. Besides, why did not the *Doctor* say that St. *Paul* had a respect to *four* sorts of angry Persons, seeing so many sorts are reckon'd up by *Aristotle*, viz. ὀργίλοι, ἀκρόχολοι, πικροὶ & χαλεποί? The reason of that, I suppose, was because he did not look into *Aristotle* himself, but cited his words upon trust; for what he alledges out of him is not in either of those places which he refers to, but in *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 11. If we reason out of *Aristotle*, St. *Paul* here will not condemn the ὀργίλοι, that is, those who tho they are soon angry, soon forgive, but the excessive anger of other Persons.

II. The place referred to in the *Psalms* is in *Psal.* iv. 4. not in ii. 4. but our Author could not infer any thing from thence, because the Hebrew word רִגְזוּ *rigzou*, ought rather to be rendred *fear*, tho the *Septuagint*, whom St. *Paul* follows out of Custom, translate it otherwise.

III. The Passage alledged out of *Plutarch* is much more pertinent than that out of *Aristotle.* And it is *pag.* 488. *Ed. Wechelianæ.*

Vers. 30. *Note* k. I. By *the Holy Spirit*, here seems to be meant the Gifts of the Holy Ghost conferred by God on the *Ephesians*, whereby they were enabled to work Miracles; for by them they were *sealed*, as sufficiently appears from what is said by Dr. *Hammond.* But because those Gifts were bestowed on the *Ephesians* by a *Person*, therefore they are forbidden here *to grieve* them, that is, to do any thing which might displease the Person from whom those Gifts came, or provoke him to withdraw them. But St. *Paul* seems principally to refer to the Gift of Prophecy, which lewd Discourse corrupted and renderd useless. For it appears by other places, that those who had received that Gift were obliged to preserve it by care and holiness of Life, which if they neglected to do, it was taken away from them. See 1 *Tim.* iv. 14.

*

II. Our

Chapter IV.

II. Our Author confounds things which ought to be diſtinguiſhed; for *Chriſt* is not ſaid to have been *ſealed by the Father*, juſt in the ſame ſenſe as the *Epheſians* and others, who had received the Gifts of the Spirit. God is ſaid to have *ſealed* Chriſt by way of Alluſion, not to any ordinary Servants, but to the Ambaſſadors of Kings; who are then firſt believed when they produce their Maſters Letters marked with their Seal. *Labour not*, ſaith Chriſt in *John* vi. 27. *for the Meat which periſheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto everlaſting Life, which the Son of Man ſhall give unto you; for him hath God the Father ſealed*, ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός· that is, hath ſent with Power and Inſtructions, as you may ſee by his Miracles, which are as the Seal of God, for which ye ought to believe me. But the *Epheſians* are ſaid to be *ſealed to the day of Redemption*, by a Metaphor taken from Merchandizes or Slaves, which the buyer did not take away with him as ſoon as he had bought them. See my Note on 2 *Cor.* i. 22.

III. I cannot ſee to what purpoſe our Author, tho it is but by the way, ſets down the Etymology of the word *ſervi* from *ſervando*, when he is explaining an Author who wrote in Greek, and could not have any reſpect to that Latin word.

IV. Our Author's interpretation of the words, *to grieve the Holy Spirit*, and *to the day of Redemption*, is perfectly forced. The meaning of the Apoſtle is this: "Ye that have received Gifts from the "Holy Spirit, do not either by neglecting them or deſpiſing them "grieve him, and provoke him to take away from you thoſe "things which he has given you, to diſtinguiſh you from other Men "even in this World; till that day comes, in which in the view of "Men and Angels, he will diſtinguiſh you from all the reſt of *Adam*'s "Poſterity. See my Note on *Rom.* viii. 21.

Verſ. 31. Πᾶσα πικρία, καὶ θυμὸς, καὶ ὀργὴ, καὶ κραυγὴ, καὶ βλασφημία.] By theſe words Dr. *Hammond* might have diſcerned that St. *Paul* had no reference, when he wrote this, to *Ariſtotle*'s diſtinction between the ſeveral degrees of Anger, becauſe he does not reduce them to the Order and Notions of that Philoſopher: Which it may not be unuſeful to ſhew briefly, out of *Ariſtotle* himſelf, by alledging his words. For by this alone it will appear that Interpreters ought to omit all unneceſſary Niceties, in explaining the *rude* or *idiotick* Stile (as St. *Paul* himſelf calls it) of this Holy Apoſtle. That Philoſopher therefore in *Mor.* Lib. 4. c. ii. ſetting down the ſeveral degrees of Anger, and proceeding from thoſe who are leaſt vitious in that kind, to thoſe who are tainted with the higheſt degree of this Vice, defines ὀργίλους to be ſo called ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὀργίλοι ταχέως μὲν ὀργίζονται, καὶ οἷς ὁ δεῖ, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς

ὃ

ὦ δεῖ, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ· παύονται δὲ ταχέως· ὃ καὶ βέλτιστον ἔχουσι: They that are called ὀργίλοι *are such as are soon angry, and with those that they ought not, and for those things which they ought not, and more than they ought. But their Anger is soon over, and this is their best property.* And a little after he says: ὑπερβολὴν δ' εἶναι οἱ ἀκρόχολοι ὀξεῖς καὶ σφόδρα πᾶν ὀργίλοι, καὶ ὅτι παντί· ὅθεν καὶ τ' ὄνομα: *The* ἀκρόχολοι *are those that are beyond measure fierce and angry at every thing, and for every thing, which is the reason of their being so called.* After which he proceeds to the third sort, and saith: οἱ δὲ πικροὶ δυσδιάλυτοι καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ὀργίζονται, κατέχουσι γὰρ τὸν θυμόν· παῦλα δὲ γίνεται ὅταν ἀντιτιθῶσιν· ἡ γὰρ τιμωρία παύει τὴν ὀργήν, ἡδονὴν ἀντὶ τῆς λύπης ἐμποιοῦσα· τοῦτο δὲ μὴ γινομένου, τὸ βάρος ἔχουσι, διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ δῆλον ποιεῖν ἔναι, οὐ δοκεῖ συμπνίγειν αὐτὸς ἰδίως· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ πέψαι τινὰ ὀργὴν χρόνος δεῖ· εἰσὶ δὲ τοιοῦτοι ἑαυτοῖς ὀχληρότατοι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς φίλοις: *But the* πικροὶ *are* (those that) *are hardly reconciled and are angry a great while; for they keep in their Anger, and it ceases when they have revenged themselves. For revenge extinguishes anger, by causing Pleasure where before was Grief. But when this is not done they are pressed with* (an inward) *weight; for because they do not manifest their Anger, no one endeavours to appease them. And for a Man to digest his Anger within himself, requires time. Now such Men as these, as they are a great torment to themselves, so they are most of all to their Friends.* Lastly, those who are vitious in the highest degree in this kind, he describes thus: χαλεπὸς δὲ λέγομεν τὸς ἐφ' οἷς τε μὴ δεῖ καλεπαίνοντας, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, καὶ πλείω χρόνον, καὶ μὴ διαλλαττομένους ἀνὰ τιμωρίας, ἢ καλάσεως: *We call those* χαλεποὶ *who are angry both for those things which they ought not, and more and longer than they ought, and are never appeased without Revenge or Punishment.* By these descriptions it sufficiently appears that St. *Paul* did not take the several words whereby he describes Anger in this place, from the use of Philosophers, or dispose them in the same order; nor is that his Custom, but to take mostly what he says from vulgar use, and dispose it without any Philosophical or Rhetorical Artifice.

CHAP. V.

Vers. 2. Note a. I. Προσφορὰ and θυσία may, I confess, be distinguished as Dr. *Hammond* would have them, but they are very often confounded; and προσφορὰ particularly frequently signifies all kind of Oblations, in Hebrew קרבן *Korban*, or whatever is laid upon the Altar, as *Kircher's Concordances* will inform those who are ignorant. In this place they seem to signify the same thing, because the scope of the Apostle does not oblige us to distinguish them.

Chapter V.

II. Our Author's reasoning to this purpose from *Heb.* x. 5, 6. has no validity in it: for it is not necessary that these two words occurring in *vers.* 6. should be perfectly synonimous or answerable to those two others in *ver.* 5. *Wherefore*, saith that divine Writer, *when he cometh into the World, he saith*, θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν, *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not*, but a Body hast thou fitted me, in ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *whole Burnt-offerings, and for Sin thou hast had no pleasure.* If according to Dr. *Hammond*'s reasoning, a whole *Burnt-offering*, ὁλοκάυτωμα, and *a Sacrifice* θυσία be exactly the same, an *offering* προσφορὰ and a sacrifice for Sin περὶ ἁμαρτίας will be literally the same also, which yet he would not allow. But the words of the sacred Writers must not be reduced to the rules of Rhetoricians.

Vers. 3. Πλεονεξία.] Our Author in his Note on *Rom.* i. 29. endeavours all he can to prove that this word signifies a *desire*, not of Riches, but of *Pleasures*; tho with what success I leave the Reader to judg, by what I have written on that Annotation. This is the chief place that gives any countenance to his conjecture. And indeed there are two specious reasons which, as to this Passage of St. *Paul*, may be alledged on his behalf.

I. It is said ἀκαθαρσία Ἢ πλεονεξία, *Uncleanness OR Covetousness*, and the Particle ἢ *or* seems to join together words of the same signification. In answer to which I acknowledg that that is very frequently the use of the Particle ἢ *or*; but it is very often also a Disjunctive, and connects together words of a different sense. And when a Negation follows or goes before, it is equivalent to *nor*, as in this place; for it is all one as if St. *Paul* had said: "Let neither Fornication, nor any "Uncleanness, nor Covetousness be named amongst you.

II. It may be said that the words *not be named among you*, contain a prohibition which agrees better to *Lusts*, whereof the very names are obscene, than to Covetousness, or the Sins which proceed from that Vice. Which I do not deny; nay, I think St. *Paul* spake thus, merely because he had before made mention of *Fornication* and *Uncleanness*, to which that prohibition seems properly to belong. But it cannot hence be inferred, that πλεονεξία signifies a vice of the same kind with those beforemention'd, contrary to the etymology and perpetual use of the word; for it is very common for one Verb to be subjoined or prefixed to many Nouns, with all which it does not equally well agree. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, on the word *Verbum*.

Vers. 4. *Note* b. All that our Author here says is very much to the purpose; to which add, that Men of debauched Lives use to call their Vices by soft and gentle names. For which reason μωρολογία & ἐυτραπελία might

might properly ſignify, in common uſe, not only light and raſh, but even obſcene and filthy Diſcourſes, ſuch as the Jeſts which we every where meet with, eſpecially in antient Comedies. This *Plutarch* has obſerved with relation to the *Athenians*, in the Life of *Solon*, p. 86. Ἃ γὰρ ὦν, ſaith he, οἱ νεώτεροι τὰς Ἀθηναίων λέγουσι τὰς τῶν πραγμάτων δυσχερείας ὀνόμασι χρηστοῖς καὶ φιλανθρώποις ἐπικαλύπτοντας αὐτοὺς ὑποκορίζεσθαι, τοὺς μὲ πόρους εἰρήνας, τοὺς δὲ φόρους συντάξεις, φυλακὰς δὲ τὰς φρουρὰς τῆς πόλεως, δίκημα δὲ τὸ δεσμωτήριον καλοῦντας, πρῶτον Σόλωνος ἦν, ὡς ἔοικε, σόφισμα τὴν τῶν χρεῶν ἀποκοπὴν εὐσταλθῆναι ὀνομάσαντος: *For what is ſaid of late, that the* Athenians, *covering odious things with mild and pleaſing Titles, to avoid giving offence, call Strumpets Companions, Taxing Regiſtring, Gariſons Safeguards of Cities, and a Priſon a Houſe; that ſeems to have been firſt the device of* Solon, *who called the forgiving of Debts an Acquittance.* Other examples to the ſame purpoſe may be had out of *Helladius Beſantinous* in *Chreſtomathiis*. We may eaſily conceive how ſuch ſort of Men might call their obſcene and filthy Diſcourſes by the names of εὐφημία & εὐτραπελία.

Chapter V.

Ibid. *Note* c. This latter Interpretation would very well agree to this place, if it were certain that εὐχαριστία was ever taken in the ſame ſenſe with τὸ εὔχαρι, which ſignifies *elegancy* of Speech, as well as of other things. The paſſage cited out of *Prov.* xi. does not at all belong to this matter, the Diſcourſe there being about a *beautiful*, not a *pious* Woman.

Verſ. 14. Διὸ λέγει.] *Viz. γραφὴ the Scripture*, the Apoſtle here referring to the place in *Iſaiah* alledged by our Author in his Paraphraſe, tho rather expreſſing its ſenſe than citing the Prophet's own words. *Barnabas* in *Epiſt. Catholica*, particularly in *cap.* v. often uſes the ſame term in citing the Scriptures words: *Scriptum eſt enim*, ſaith he, *de illo, quædam ad populum Judæorum, quædam ad nos.* DICIT *autem ſic:* Vulneratus eſt propter iniquitates noſtras, &c. *Supergratulari enim debemus Domino, quia & præterita nobis oſtendit & ſapientes fecit, & de futuris ut non ſimus ſine intellectu.* DICIT *autem:* Non injuſte tenduntur retia avibus. *For it is written of him, ſome things* (relate) *to the People of the* Jews, *and ſome to us. And he* SAITH *thus:* He was wounded for our Tranſgreſſions, &c. *For we ought to be exceeding thankful to the Lord, becauſe he hath both ſhewed us paſt things, and* (ſo) *made us wiſe*, and (inſtructed) us *alſo in the knowledg of things Future, that we might not be without underſtanding* (as to them.) *And he* SAITH: Not without cauſe are Nets ſpread for Birds. A great many more examples to the ſame purpoſe might be alledged out of that Epiſtle.

Verſ. 16. *Note* e. It being manifeſt from the place cited out of *Daniel* in the beginning of this Annotation, that the phraſe *to redeem*

Chapter V.

the time, ſignifies to delay, or put off as long as poſſible; that only Notion of it ſhould have been kept to; and not things of an Affinity with it, or very diſtant from it mixed together, as they are here by our Author, that he might have an occaſion to obtrude his *Gnoſticks* upon us: See *Grotius* on this place. St. *Paul* here adviſes the *Epheſians* to endeavour by all lawful means to get time allowed them by the *Heathens*, and to take heed leſt by their raſh fervour they ſhould bring Perſecution upon themſelves, eſpecially in an evil and troubleſom time, ſuch as that was wherein he wrote this Epiſtle; which was towards the end of *Nero*'s reign, or thoſe black and diſmal days in which that monſter of a Man outdid all that ever went before him in Wickedneſs and Villany. The reaſon of the Apoſtle's Admonition is this, that there was a time coming wherein the Truth might be defended with leſs danger. And the nature of Truth is ſuch, that if it have but time allowed it, and is not preſently extinguiſhed, tho it lie cover'd as it were under Aſhes for a while, yet afterwards in a fitter time it ſhines out, and makes an univerſal day. So that thoſe who defend it, ought never, as long as they can avoid it, to run all adventures, or undergo the laſt hazard, that it may either triumph inſtantly over Falſhood, or elſe unavoidably be oppreſſed for ever.

Now I am apt to think that this phraſe had its riſe from the cuſtom of Debters, who when paiment is demanded of them, and they cannot reſtore the whole ſum or principal due, obtain a longer time to diſcharge their Debt in, either by a preſent Fee, or by advancing the uſe of the Mony lent them. For this is truly *to redeem time*; whence it afterwards came to paſs, that becauſe the ſolution of a Debt is thus deferred, therefore to defer or delay is ſometimes called *to redeem the time*. Parallel to this is the Latin phraſe *moram acquirere*, which occurs in *Cicero* pro *Cæcina* cap. ii. or Num. 6. where the Delegates, who had, after twice hearing the Cauſe, deferred to paſs Sentence, are ſaid *moram ad condemnandum acquiſiviſſe*, and alſo to have given the Defendant a ſpace wherein to recollect himſelf.

Verſ. 18. *Note* f. There was no need here of the *Bacchanals* or *Gnoſticks*, becauſe there were Heathens enough in *Aſia* that loved Wine, and whenever they had an opportunity drank to exceſs, and indulged themſelves in other Luſts; whoſe example might have had a bad influence upon the Chriſtians, if they did not take great heed to themſelves.

Verſ. 19. *Note* g. Our Author has ſhewn indeed here, that *Songs* are called by three ſeveral names; but that thoſe were ſo many different kinds no one can prove, becauſe they are often confounded, as appears

appears by the titles of the *Pſalms*. The Greek words might alſo be referred to ſeveral ſorts of Songs, if the moſt frequent uſe of them be reſpected, but thoſe alſo are often put one for another. So that I ſhould rather ſay that St. *Paul* here does but expreſs the ſame thing in three different words. Chapter V.

Verſ. 21. Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.] That is, ſo complying with each other, as yet to do nothing which may diſpleaſe God to gratify any one whatſoever. That this is here the ſignification of the Verb ὑποτάσσεσθαι may appear by the word ἀλλήλοις, which ſhews that it is *a mutual ſubjection*, that is, *compliance*, which is here ſpoken of. So the Noun ὑποταγὴ muſt be underſtood in *Gal.* ii. 5. where St. *Paul* ſpeaking of falſe Brethren ſaith: *To whom we did not ſo much as for an hour give place*, ὑποταγῇ, by *compliance*. Yet *Grotius* to explain the word ὑποτασσόμενοι here ſaith thus: *nempe ſecundum ordinem naturalem, civilem, eccleſiaſticum, quæ omnia nobis ſervanda, propter Chriſtum*: viz. *according to order, whether natural, civil, or eccleſiaſtical, which muſt all be kept for Chriſt's ſake.* And this Dr. *Hammond* follows in his Paraphraſe. But to ſignify *that*, it ſhould have been ſaid: ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ὑπερέχουσι, or τοῖς ὑποτασσομένοις, or ſomething to that purpoſe, and not ἀλλήλοις, which ſhews that it is a mutual Duty here intended.

Verſ. 30. *Note* h. Our Author here compares together things that have no agreement with one another, for *to be of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood*, is not to be Chriſt himſelf, as that which is called *the Heaven and Earth* is the very Univerſe, but to be very intimately joined to Chriſt, in like manner as Kinſmen by Blood, and Man and Wife are to one another. See *Grotius* on this place, and my Notes on *Gen.* ii. 34.

Verſ. 31. Καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος.] This is not a *Precept* wherein Matrimony is commanded, or its Laws enforced; but an *obſervation* of a Cuſtom begun ever ſince *Adam*, and propagated to all Mankind. See my Note on *Gen.* ii. 24.

Verſ. 32. Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.] I. From *verſ.* 23. of this Chapter St. *Paul* compares the love which does or ought to intercede between Man and Wife, with the love of *Chriſt* and the Church; for which reaſon he mixes Precepts belonging to married Perſons, with Precepts which relate to the love of the Church towards *Chriſt*. And therefore he ſubjoins *verſ.* 31. in which the union of the Husband with the Wife is deſcribed, immediately and without any tranſition after the foregoing words, whereby he had deſcribed the union of the Church with *Chriſt*; not becauſe they belong to the ſame Argument, but becauſe he ſo mixes the thing compared, with the thing to which it is compared. If he had intended to make a perfect Compariſon, he

Chapter V. would first have set down that which relates to *Christ* and the Church ἐν πρώτοις, and afterwards described the conjunction of Man and Wife ἐν ἀποδόσει; but he makes use of an imperfect comparison, in which the ὑπόδειγμα is hardly distinguished from the πρώτωμα. His meaning may be expressed in this Paraphrase. "*Vers.* 30. For between us and *Christ* "there intercedes so near a conjunction, that we may be called his "Flesh and Bones, as it is said of a Woman with relation to her "Husband. So that as *Christ* loves his Church, as if it were his Wife "and so his own Body; 31, 32. so Husbands having left their Fathers "House for the sake of their Wives, and become as it were one Flesh "with them, should look upon it as their Duty to love their Wives as "themselves. If we carefully read St. *Paul*'s words, and consider the scope of his Discourse, we shall not doubt but this is his meaning. For the Apostle's design here, at least *primarily* and *professedly*, is not to teach any thing concerning *Christ*; but from the noted example of *Christ* to shew what conjunction and intimacy of Affection there ought to be between *Man and Wife*. So that what he says of Christ, is said but by the way, and assumed as sufficiently known.

II. This being supposed, it will be easy to perceive that the 32d *verse* is a *Parenthesis* inserted between words belonging to the same thing, but which make nothing to the series of the Discourse. And by this *Parenthesis* the intention of the Apostle is only to shew, that what he had said about that intimate union of Christ with his Church for which he suffer'd Death, was hitherto unknown to Mankind. This he calls μέγα μυστήριον, as in 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. and so these words are referred, not to the mystical sense of the place in *Genesis*, but to the thing it self; that is, to the love of *Christ* to his Church, which was so great that he did not refuse to die for its sake. Away therefore with that mystical sense, which is without reason sought for in the words of *Moses*, as by the suggestion here of the Apostle.

III. But what shall we say then to those *Jews*, whom our Author cites in his Paraphrase, as knowing that great Mystery from the secret sense of the words of *Moses*? To speak what I think, they are either the words of some Impostor acting the part of a *Jew*, or misconstrued to a wrong sense. Our Author took this Testimony from *H. Grotius*, who on this place saith: *Sic & Hebræi aiunt mulierem de latere viri desumtam, ad significandum conjugium viri supremi, benedicti: So the* Jews *also say that the Woman was taken out of the side of the Man, to signify the marriage of the highest, blessed Man.* But where are those *Jews* who say this? Do they with one consent speak thus in any publick form? Or is it some *Rabbin* who proposes his own Conjecture, or the

the Tradition of the Antients? Such Citations as these, in a matter of no small moment, or not universally known, should be avoided by learned Men; seeing they cannot be relied on, unless it be supposed that a vain uncertain report may be so. But I know, if I am not mistaken, whence *Grotius* took this observation; *to wit* from *Camero*, who himself had it from *Sebast. Munster*, the first Author of it, in his Annotations on *Gen.* ii. 24 *Hebræi magistri*, saith he, *docent id quod Paulus docuit*, &c. *The Jewish* Rabbins *teach the same thing which is taught by St.* Paul, *that a Man should love his Wife as his own Body, and honour her more than his own Body, because of that signification and Mystery.* העלין יתברך לרמון לכרת זוג אדם. *Of which Mystery St.* Paul *also makes mention, who teaches that we are espoused to Christ.* He did not render the Hebrew words, which seem to be corrupt; but they are rendred by *Camero*, after premising that he took them from *Munster*, thus: *ad significandum conjugium viri superni, qui benedictus est*; *to signify the marriage of the Man on High, who is blessed.* And so they are rendred by *Grotius*. But אדם is not *vir*, but *Homo*; besides what is the meaning of לכרת? Should it be read לכה *to thee?* What can be the sense of these words, *the most high* Adam *shall be blessed?* In fine, both *Munster* ought to have more exactly cited his Witnesses, and others been more cautious in believing him. For who will not prove any thing from the *Jews* or others, if such Testimonies as these be admitted? I know this was the custom of the Philologers of the last Age; but it was certainly a very bad one, and justly censured by the more exquisite Wits of ours. I am apt to think it proceeded either from want of Judgment, or unfaithfulness, in their not being sensible with what caution and tenderness Testimonies ought to be handled, from which any Consectary is to be deduced, or being unwilling to have their Citations examined. Both which a Man that aims at Accuracy and pursues Truth, should be very far from; for he that would neither be deceived himself, nor deceive others, cannot desire to have what he affirms believed rashly and without examination.

Chapter V.

IV. A vast inconvenience arises from the custom of writing out other Mens Citations, unless we look into the Authors themselves from whence they are taken; because something may easily be added, whilst the sense is rather expressed than the words. The Hebrew words alledged by *Munster* can hardly be understood, and he dared not translate them. *Camero* has rendred them, and added of his own, that *the* Jews *confess the creation of a Woman out of the rib of the Man, was to signify*, &c. when *Munster* says nothing of that, but only what

Chapter VI.

I have produced out of him. *Grotius* followed *Camero*, and neither added nor changed any thing, but Dr. *Hammond* has changed *the highest Man*, who *is blessed*, into *the most High*, *God blessed for ever*. Perhaps there will come some body afterwards, and add to these words, that which our Author subjoins out of St. *Chrysostom*, as taken out of some *Rabbin*; from whence he will infer that all the mysteries of the Christian Religion were very well known to the antient *Jews*. As common Fame is magnified the further it goes, so Testimonies not looked into in the Authors themselves, are many times enlarged, as they are deliver'd from hand to hand.

CHAP. VI.

Vers. 1. Τὰ τέκνα.] Our Author here in his Paraphrase adds to Children, Subjects, and to Parents, Princes; in which he seems to have committed a double fault. *First*, in supposing that the word Children here comprehends under it *Subjects*, and the word Parents, in the Decalogue, *Magistrates*; which appears by no example, nor any reason. I do not deny indeed but that according to the most sacred Laws of human Society, and consequently of God himself, People ought to obey Magistrates, as long as they command nothing which is contrary to true Devotion, Society, or good Manners. That Obedience being as necessary and natural a Duty as for Children to obey their Parents; because without it Society, for which we are formed and born, cannot consist. But hence it does not follow that, when the Scripture speaks of the honour due to Parents, we must presently run the discourse to Magistrates. *Secondly*, he ought to have represented St. *Paul*, in his Paraphrase, speaking so as he speaks; and not fasten'd upon him a Consectary, which he did not think of. Dr. *Hammond* might, if he would, in his *Annotations* have deduced from the words of the Apostle, what seemed deducible from them, but not in his *Paraphrase*, in which St. *Paul* himself ought to speak, and not his Interpreter. But even in this Dr. *Hammond* is not so consistent with himself as he ought to be; as I shall observe on *vers.* 4. See my Notes on the fifth Commandment in *Exod.* xx.

Ibid. Ἐν Κυρίῳ] That is, as far as the Laws of God will permit, as Interpreters generally observe, which was a necessary Admonition, especially at that time in which without doubt there were a great many Heathen Parents, who were displeased with their Children for having embraced the Christian Religion. But Dr. *Hammond*, who makes the Apostle here to speak of obedience to Magistrates, interprets these words *in the Lord* by *under the Gospel*; for as to Parents, it would have been

been but ſtat to ſay, that *they* ought as much to be honoured under the Gospel as under the Law, for who could have doubted of it? But there might have been ſome among Chriſtians who thought, as moſt of the *Jews* did, that they were not to be ſubject to the Roman Magiſtrates; for which reaſon St. *Paul* more than once in his Epiſtles teaches the coutrary. But he ſays nothing at all about it in this place. See *Rom.* xiii. 1. Chapter VI.

Verſ. 2. Πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.] I am apt to think there is a *Hebraiſm* in this place, and that St. *Paul* renders the word אחרה, which perhaps he had in his mind, by the Greek πρώτη, becauſe that word ſignifies both *firſt* and *one*. And thus as the Hebrew word and the Greek μία frequently ſignify *firſt*; ſo reciprocally πρώτη *firſt* will be taken here for *one*.

Verſ. 3. Ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται.] This promiſe, in *Moſes*, belongs only to the *Jews*, and to thoſe only among *them* who were obedient to their Parents, and gave them all due Reſpect and Honour. Beſides, that which is there promiſed is a long and happy Life in *Canaan*, and that reſpected not ſo much *particular* Perſons as the *whole* Commonwealth; for if the Commonwealth were overthrown, a ſmall number who had honoured their Parents could not expect by virtue of this Promiſe, to live happily in their own Country. I do not believe that St. *Paul* underſtood this Promiſe in any other ſenſe, becauſe there can be no doubt raiſed about it. Why therefore did he mention here a Promiſe which did not at all concern the *Epheſians*? Undoubtedly not to move or perſwade them by that Promiſe to honour their Parents; but to ſhew them how very pleaſing the performance of that Duty was to God, becauſe he had formerly annexed a promiſe to the Precept wherein the Duty of Children to their Parents was enjoined. As for what our Author ſays here about a *peaceable Life* being the effect of obedience to Superiors or Magiſtrates, that as it is often true, ſo it is frequently falſe. Civil or foreign Wars, not to mention Tyranny or Arbitrary Government, do no more ſpare faithful than unfaithful Subjects. Tho it be very true, that factious Perſons, and ſuch as are deſirous of Innovations, do bring upon themſelves a great many evils from the ſupreme Power; it do's not therefore follow that ſuch as are quiet and willing to obey, do enjoy a longer or more happy Life. Which as it holds good at all times, ſo then eſpecially when the ſupreme Power is of a different perſwaſion in Religion from thoſe who honour their Parents, as it was in the time of St. *Paul*. So that what the *Doctor* ſays here about the honour which is to be given to Magiſtrates, tho true, does not belong to this place.

Chapter VI.

Verſ. 4. Οἱ πατέρες μὴ παροργίζετε.] The word πατέρες here undoubtedly ſignifies the ſame with γονεῦς, in the firſt Verſe of this *Chapter*, that is *both* Parents. But I cannot but wonder that Dr. *Hammond*, who took γονέων in that firſt Verſe to be meant of Princes as well as Parents, and thought the Apoſtle ſpoke there of that honour which is due from Subjects to Magiſtrates, ſhould not have one word about them in his Paraphraſe on this place, but make mention only of Parents. Is it ſo therefore, that when the Diſcourſe is about the Duty of Children to Parents, to Parents muſt be joined Princes; but when the Scripture ſpeaks of the Duty of Parents to Children, in that Magiſtrates are not at all concerned? Or is it true, that tho Subjects ought to obey Magiſtrates, yet there is no Duty incumbent upon Magiſtrates with reſpect to Subjects? What can be the reaſon of this difference? Surely it deſerved to be mentioned if there was any. But, to ſpeak my thoughts, our learned Author writing this in a time when he ſaw his Countrymen had roſe up in Arms againſt the King, whoſe cauſe he very much favoured, and that a great many abuſed the Power which they thought was lodged in the People, reſolved to omit no occaſion of magnifying the Authority of Kings; and carefully to avoid every thing which might ſeem to countenance the Cauſe of the People, leſt his Adverſaries ſhould abuſe it. By which it came to paſs, that ſometimes he does not ſo much perform the Office of an Interpreter, as a Preacher for the King's party. About the Cauſe it ſelf, which I have not ſufficiently conſider'd as to *England*, I paſs no judgment; but it had been better to interpret St. *Paul* ſo, as if there never had been any ſeditious Perſons in *England*, becauſe our learned Author wreſts a great many things in favour of his own ſide.

Verſ. 11. Παναπλίαν.] This word muſt not be rendred *all the Arms*, as if St. *Paul* had ſaid, take *all the Arms* which you have. For tho this word be compounded of πᾶν *all*, and ὅπλον, that is, *Arms*; yet Uſe has made it to ſignify another thing, which belongs to a particular ſort of Souldiers: *To wit*, that *heavy Armour* which was born by the *Legionarii* among the *Romans*, or thoſe that ſerved in the *Phalanges*, *Brigades* of the *Macedonians*. For tho the *Slingers* and *Archers* were furniſhed with *all the Arms*, wherewith according to Cuſtom they ought to be armed, yet the παναπλία was never ſaid to belong to them. So ὁπλῖται ſignified *heavy armed Souldiers*, without any Addition. And St. *Paul* very fitly made uſe of that word in this place, where he does not ſpeak about a *Skirmiſh* which might be made with light Armour; but about a long and ſharp engagement with very formidable Adverſaries. To which purpoſe he adviſes them not to take a Sling or a Bow,

Bow, which are light Weapons, but the Armour of *Legionary* Souldiers. Chapter VI.

Verſ. 12. *Note* a. I will not deny but that the Devils made uſe of the aſſiſtance of Hereticks, whoever they were, to deſtroy the Pious and Orthodox; but I do not believe that St. *Paul* has here a *direct* reference to any *Hereticks*. For all that is here ſaid, *immediately* at leaſt, belongs to *evil Spirits*, as *Grotius* has ſhewn, and Dr. *Hammond* acknowledges. So that there was no neceſſity for introducing here the *Gnoſticks*.

Verſ. 14. Περιζωσάμενοι.] The Apoſtle here alludes to *Iſa.* xi. 5. and at the ſame time to the Cuſtom of Soldiers. The firſt thing they did was to put a Girdle upon their Coat to keep it faſt, and hinder it from moving one way or other under their Breaſtplate; but they did not put it over their Armour, as Dr. *Hammond* thought: See *Ever. Feithius* Ant. Homeric. *Lib.* iv. c. 8. And therefore St. *Paul* ſays περιζωσάμενοι ὀσφύν, and not ὅπλα. But it muſt not be particularly or nicely enquired, why St. *Paul* compares ſome Vertues with this kind of Armour, rather than with any other; becauſe he might as well have ſaid that Chriſtians ought to take *the girdle of Righteouſneſs, and the breaſtplate of Truth*, as *the girdle of Truth and the breaſtplate of Righteouſneſs*. All that he means in this whole Diſcourſe is, that Chriſtian Vertues are Arms which good Men may and ought to uſe, both to repel the aſſaults of their Enemies, and to overcome them. Nothing elſe is here to be ſought for, unleſs we have a mind to feed our ſelves with Fancies inſtead of Realities.

Verſ. 15. *Note* b. I. It may be worth our while to read what the learned and diligent *Ant. Bynæus*, Lib. 1. Cap. 5. de *Calceis Hebræorum*, has written on this place. But I am rather of Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion, which may be confirmed by ſeveral places which he alledges, or which are to be found in thoſe Authors whom he cites. But to give further light to St. *Paul*'s words, I ſhall ſubjoin here a Paſſage out of *Virgil*, in which he deſcribes the πανοπλία of *Æneas*, and omits no part of the Armour mention'd by the Apoſtle, but the *Girdle*, nor adds any thing but the *Spear*, in *Æneid.* viii. beginning at *verſ.* 619.

Miraturque, interque manus & brachia verſat
Terribilem criſtis galeam flammaſque vomentem,
Fatiferumque enſem, loricam ex ære rigentem, &c.
Tum læves ocreas, electro auroque recocto,
Haſtamque & clypei non enarrabile textum.

II. I cannot tell whence our learned Author took this Interpretation of the *Egyptian* Cuſtom, that *the* Egyptian *Virgins were not permitted*

Chapter VI. *to wear Shoes, leſt they ſhould be ready to go abroad.* I have ſhewn out of *Diodorus Siculus*, on *Exod.* xii. 11. that it was the Cuſtom not only for Virgins, but alſo for Children to go unſhod, in *Egypt*, becauſe of the mildneſs of the Air.

Verſ. 16. Τὰ βέλη τὰ πυρὰ τὰ πεπυρωμένα.] Our Author in his Paraphraſe is of opinion, that the Apoſtle here alludes to *poiſonous Darts, which*, ſaith he, *are called* fiery *becauſe they inflame the parts that are wounded with them, as Serpents with poiſonous Stings are called fiery Serpents.* But I do not think that all ſort of *poiſonous* Serpents may be called *fiery*; becauſe the biting of all ſuch Serpents does not hurt by cauſing an inflammation, and there is a *peculiar* kind of Serpents called by that name. I ſhould rather ſay that the *Darts* of the Devil are called here *fiery*, by a Metaphor taken from the fiery Darts, which the beſieged uſe to fling at the Souldiers and Works of the Beſiegers, whereof there is frequent mention made in the Hiſtories of the Antients, where Sieges are deſcribed. I ſhall produce but one example, in a matter very well known, out of the Writer of the *Spaniſh War*, cap. xi. *Noctis*, ſaith he, *tertia vigiliâ, in oppido acerrime pugnatum eſt, ignemque multum miſerunt; ſicut & omne genus, quibus ignis per jactus ſolitus eſt mitti: In the third watch of the Night, they fought in the Town very ſharply, and threw a great deal of Fire, as alſo all kind (of Darts) in which Fire uſes to be thrown.* Theſe are *fiery* Darts properly ſo called; which lighting upon an iron Shield, could do no harm to the Souldiers. And St. *Paul* here ſeems to have called the Darts of the Devil *fiery*, rather than by any *other* Epithet; becauſe they do miſchief by inflaming the ſenſual Appetite.

Verſ. 18. Περὶ πάντων ἁγίων.] Our Author, as appears by his Paraphraſe, and the Note in the Margin, thought that the word πραγμάτων ſhould here be underſtood, and ſo renders this laſt part of the Verſe, *concerning all Holy things.* And it is certain that an *Elliptis* of that word is very common in the Greek Language, but never in ſuch a Phraſe as this that I know of. And therefore I had rather follow the *Vulgar* and other Interpreters, till an example be alledged, in which πάντα ἅγια is the ſame with πᾶσα ἁγιωσύνη, or in which Ἅπασι περὶ πάντων ἁγίων ſignifies, evidently, *Prayers for the obtaining all Holineſs.*

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Philippians*.

AT the end of the *Præmon.*] I. I rather refer this Epiſtle, as the foregoing, to the Year of Chriſt LXII. with Dr. *Pearſon*, whom I deſire the Reader to conſult in his *Annales Paulinæ*.

II. Inſtead of the *Gnoſticks*, who had formerly been Heathens, and which our Author too eaſily ſuppoſes to have been almoſt in all places where the Apoſtles had preached, I rather think S. *Paul* here refers to the *Jews*, who it is certain were diſperſed throughout the whole *Roman* Empire, and being tenacious of their own Ceremonies, endeavoured to impoſe them upon all others.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. WHat Dr. *Hammond* here ſays of *Philippi*, may be confirmed by other Arguments, by which it will become more manifeſt. It is very true that *Philippi* was a *Roman* Colony; as appears not only from the expreſs Teſtimonies of the Antients, but alſo from the Coins of that City. There is a piece of *Philippian* Money coined in honour of *Claudius*, the backſide of which has this Inſcription; *COL. AUG. JUL. PHILIPP.* that is, *Colonia Auguſta Julia Philippenſis*. And there are other pieces coined in the times of *M. Aurelius*, *Commodus*, and *Caracalla*, that have the like Inſcriptions. The learned *Joan. Foy-Vaillant* had reaſon to think that the name *Julia* ſignified that *Julius* firſt planted a Colony at *Philippi*, as *Auguſta* that another was afterwards order'd thither by *Auguſtus*. After which Obſervation, he produces a place out of *Dio* lib. 51. where he ſpeaks thus about *Auguſtus*, after the Victory at *Actium*: Τὺς δήμους τὺς ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, τὺς τε ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀντωνίου φρονήσαντας ἐζημίωσε, τῶν τε πεπρωκότων τὰς τε πόλεις καὶ χωρία αὐτῶν ἐκρεσ-

σαλο-

Chapter I. ασδ' ἐκείνων ἢ δὴ τῆς μ' φιλίσσι τό, τε Δυῤῥάχιον, καὶ τὰς Φιλίππους ἄλλα τε ἐπικαῖ ἀντέδωκε: *Having baniſhed thoſe People in* Italy *which had favoured* Antonius, *he gave their Cities and Territories to his Soldiers. But inſtead of them, he gave the greateſt part of thoſe whom he had baniſhed,* Dyrrachium *and* Philippi, *and other Towns, to inhabit.* By this it appears, how a little before St. *Paul*'s time, *Philippi* came to be enlarged, becauſe that City had twice received a Colony of *Romans*. We may conſult *Foy-Vaillant*, on *Numiſmata ærea Coloniarum*. The ſame Author teſtifies, that *Philippi*, in pieces of Coin, is ſtiled *Metropolis*. But that there was any regard had in that to Eccleſiaſtical order, or dignity of Biſhops, even from the very time of St. *Paul*, Dr. *Hammond* has not proved, nor will any other, I believe, prove; tho the thing be undoubtedly more antient than many think. The Paſſage alledged out of the *Digeſt.* is in lib. 50. tit. 15. *de cenſibus*, leg. 8. §. 8. and is *Paulus*'s, not *Ulpian*'s, as is ſaid by our Author; who, it ſeems, cited him upon truſt. He might have added that of *Celſus* in leg. 6. *Colonia Philippenſis juris Italici eſt.*

II. Our Author affirms, that after *Veſpaſian* had brought a Colony into *Cæſarea*, that City *became* immediately, *even in reſpect of Eccleſiaſtical Government, a Metropolis*; *under which* Jeruſalem *it ſelf was.* But at that time there was *no Jeruſalem*, becauſe it had been razed to the ground, and was not rebuilt till under *Adrian*, who put into it a *Roman* Colony; as we are told by *Xiphilinus* in the Life of *Adrian*, and as appears by a great many Medals in which it is called *COL. ÆL. CAP. Colonia Ælia Capitolina.* And who told our Author there was a Biſhop at *Cæſarea* in the time of *Veſpaſian?* From what marks of Antiquity did he gather that the *Cæſarean* Biſhops were reckoned ſuperior in Dignity and Order to thoſe of *Jeruſalem*, from the Age of *Veſpaſian?* If what he ſays be true, that a City which had a *Roman* Colony brought into it was made a *Metropolis*, *Jeruſalem* enjoyed that Privilege as well as *Cæſarea*, tho not quite ſo ſoon. *Ulpian*, in the foremention'd *Tit. lib.* 1. §. 6. ſaith, *Palæſtina duæ fuerunt Coloniæ, & Cæſarienſis & Ælia Capitolina, ſed neutra jus Italicum habet.* But I look upon this alſo as improbable.

III. I am ready to think, that the reaſon why the Antients place *Philippi* ſometimes in *Thrace*, and ſometimes in *Macedonia*, is not becauſe thoſe Provinces were variouſly divided, which yet I do not deny; but becauſe when Cities ſtand upon the borders of any two Countries, it is doubtful to which of them they belong. The ſame I ſay of *Nicopolis*. What our Author ſays beſides about many Churches, and thoſe *Epiſcopal*, depending upon the Metropolis of *Philippi*, is nothing

thing but Conjecture, which I am not wholly for rejecting, but which I do not eaſily believe. Learned Men often partly *prove* things out of the Ancients, and partly make up by Gueſs and Conjecture what they would have to be true; then they equal their Conjectures to that which they have proved, and from all put together they very eaſily infer what they pleaſe. Becauſe St. *Paul* preached the Goſpel firſt at *Philippi*, does it preſently follow that that City was alſo accounted the *Metropolis*, in reſpect of Eccleſiaſtical Order? The reſt alſo is very deceitful and uncertain. Chapter I.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. The Opinion of *Grotius* and others ſeems to be much plainer; who think that as the words *Presbyter* and *Biſhop* are promiſcuouſly uſed, tho' there was one *Biſhop* κατ' ἐξοχὴν ſo called: ſo alſo the word *Biſhop* ſignifies both Orders, firſt and ſecond; which is the reaſon why we meet with this word in the Plural Number where the Diſcourſe is but of one Church. There was a Communion of Names between Miniſters of the firſt and ſecond Rank, ſo that thoſe of the firſt Rank were ſometimes ſtiled *Presbyters*, and thoſe of the ſecond *Biſhops*; not becauſe their Authority was the ſame, and their Office in every reſpect alike, but becauſe there was little or no difference between them as to preaching the Goſpel, and adminiſtring the Sacraments. But the particular Power of Ordination might belong to *one* Biſhop, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, ſo called.

II. That which our Author ſays about *Metropolitans*, and by the help of which alone he defends himſelf againſt his Adverſaries, as to thoſe Apoſtolical Times, is very uncertain; nor can it be proved by the Authority of the Writers of the following Ages, who ſpeak of the Primitive Times according to the Cuſtoms of their own, and not from any certain Knowledg: not to ſay at preſent, that Biſhops or Presbyters aſpiring to that Dignity, cannot always ſafely be heard in their own cauſe. It is not probable that there was any Epiſcopal Church in the Proconſular *Aſia*, beſides *Epheſus*, at the time ſpoken of in *Acts* xx. or in *Macedonia*, beſides *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*. But a little while after, when the number of Chriſtians was encreaſed, there were other Epiſcopal Seats conſtituted in them.

Ibid. *Note* c. I. *I* alſo have ſpoken pretty largely of the word διακόνων on *Luke* viii. 2. and I ſhall not repeat what I have there ſaid. Our Author in the beginning of this Note uſes the word *dimenſum* for *demenſum*, tho that it ſelf was not proper to be uſed in this place, becauſe *demenſum* ſignifies the Portion or Allowance of *Servants*, not of *Gueſts*. See *Frid. Taubmannus* on *Plautus* his *Stich*, *Acts* i. *Sc.* ii. *verſ.* 3.

Chapter I.

II. I think indeed with Dr. *Hammond*, that the Original of *Deacons* must be fetched from the *Jews*, and that *Deacons* were in the Christian Church what the חזנים *bhazanim*, were in the Jewish Synagogue. But I do not think we have any thing to do here with the שוטרים *ſchoterim*, which was the Name only of the Officers that attended upon Magiſtrates, or certain publick Criers. See my *Note* on *Exod. ver.* 8.

III. Nor do I think that *Juniors*, ought to be confounded with the *Charanitæ*, eſpecially in *Acts* v. 6. where any of the younger ſort, who were accidentally then preſent, ſeem to be meant. Tho the Diſciples of Doctors are called *Juniors*, in *Maimonides*, it does not therefore follow that that word muſt be ſo taken where-ever we meet with it.

IV. The Saying of the Jews about the decay of Learning among them, which our Author ſpeaks of, is, in *Sotæ*, *fol.* 49. 1. thus, מיום שחרב ב"ה שרו חכימיא למחוי כספריא וספריא כחזנא וחזנא כעמא דארעא: *Since the ſecond Houſe was deſtroyed, the wiſe Men began to be as the Scribes, and the Scribes as the Miniſter of the Synagogue, and laſtly the Miniſter of the Synagogue as the People of the Earth.* Which Dr. *Hammond* miſtranſlates, and inverts the Words themſelves. They may be found by thoſe that may perhaps have a mind to turn to them in the Editions of *Joan. Chr. Wagenſeilius*, in *Sotæ*, Cap. ix. S. 15. It appears that our Author did not look into this Saying himſelf, but went upon truſt for it, and that made him render it ſo ill, and not ſo much as refer to the Book in which it is ſet down.

Verſ. 13. *Note* e.] Some years ago there aroſe a great Controverſy about this place, between two Gentlemen very skilful in the Roman Antiquities, *Ulricus Huberus* and *Jac. Perizonius*, concerning the Signification of the word *Prætorium* here; whence there was a conſiderable Volume made, which may be read by thoſe who are curious about ſuch Matters, not without advantage. *Huberus* thought that *Prætorium*, where the Diſcourſe was about Civil Affairs, ſignified the *Palace* of *Cæſar*, or properly his Judgment-hall; but *Perizonius*, a Body of Prætorian Troops, or the Camp in which the *Prætor*'s Guards uſed to pitch their Tents. And there is no doubt but that the moſt frequent notion of the Word, in the beſt Writers, is agreeable to the Opinion of this latter. And ſo S. *Paul*'s meaning will be, that his Bonds, that is, the Reaſon for which he was caſt into Bonds, was known to the *Prætor*'s Guards, to which the Soldiers with whom he was bound, might have brought him. Yet others quote a Paſſage in *Cicero*, in which *Prætorium* ſeems to ſignify a publick Place of Judicature, in *Orat.* 5. againſt *Verres*,

Verres, cap. ult. *Vos omnes rerum forenſium, conſiliorum maximorum, legum, judiciorumque arbitri & teſtes celeberrimo in loco* PRÆTORII *locati, Caſtor & Pollux*, &c. *Ye Judges and Witneſſes of all matters belonging to Court, of the greateſt Counſels, Laws and Suits, who are ſeated in the place of the* Prætorium, *Caſtor & Pollux*, &c. The *Forum* is the place in which was the Judgment-ſeat of the *Prætor*, which may ſeem to confirm the Interpretation of *Phavorinus* and Dr. *Hammond*. For it appears, that there was in the *Forum* a Temple dedicated to the *Caſtors*, by *Suetonius* in the Life of *Julius Cæſar* cap. x. But it is not probable that St. *Paul*, who had appealed to *Cæſar*, was judged by a City *Prætor*; and I am rather of *Perizonius* his Opinion. See his 1ſt. *Diſſert. de Prætorio*, S. 35. & *ſeqq.* Chapter I.

Verſ. 23. *Note* h. I. What our Author ſays about the word פשר he owed in part to *Grotius*, but it is not a *Hebrew* word which has that ſignification, but a *Chaldee* and *Syriack* one, as *Lexicons* will ſhew. When *Grotius* ſaid *it was commonly uſed by the* Jews *to ſignify Death*, he meant only the *Rabbins*; who often ſpeak more in *Chaldee* than in *Hebrew*.

II. That which our Author here ſays about the word ἀναλῦσαι, may ſerve to confirm what I have ſaid againſt him about another compound of the ſame Primitive, on *Luke* ix. 12. The conjecture of *Philoponus*, about the reaſon why a particular ſort of Method is called ἀναλυτικὴ, tho very agreeable to the nature of the thing, yet ſeems to be falſe; becauſe the term ἀναλυτικὴ muſt be underſtood by its oppoſition to συνθετικὴ, which is another kind of Method. And that being called συνθετικὴ which gathers up Principles, and deduces Conſectaries from them compounded and joined together, by ἀναλυτικὴ muſt neceſſarily be meant that which reſolves things conjoined, and ſeparates the parts, to make way for the knowledg of each particular. And indeed that is the uſe of this Method, as every one knows. *Phavorinus* ſaith much righter than *Philoponus*: Ἀναλύῃ, ἀντὶ τῦ συμπλοκὴς τῶν πραγμάτων ἐξ ἀρχῆς διαλύῃ· ὅθεν καὶ ἀναλυτικὴ ἡ ἀνάλυσις ἐπιστήμη· καὶ ἀναλύῃ, ἀντὶ τῦ ἀπαλλάξεται. Συνίσησι δὲ, καὶ ἀρχῶς ἀνάλυσιν ὁ τῆς γεωμετρίας Ἀλέξανδρος· καὶ ἀναλύειν λέγεται τὸ τὰς συνθέτους συλλογισμὰς ἀνάγειν εἰς τὰς ἁπλᾶς, καὶ εἰς τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐξ ὧν αὐτῆς τὸ εἶναι. Whence it appears that ἀναλῦσαι is here rightly indeed rendred by *reverti*, *to return*, but that this interpretation of it is ill confirmed by the name ἀναλυτικὴ.

ANNOTATIONS on

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 6. *Note* a. OUR Author has well enough confuted, in this place, the Interpretation of *Grotius*, but has propoſed nothing more certain inſtead of it, nor ſufficiently conſider'd the ſeries of the Diſcourſe.

I. He ought not to have interpreted ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων as if it were θεὸς ὤν, without bringing an example of the like phraſe. For as to the word μορφὴ ſeparately conſider'd, ſuppoſing that ſignified what our Author affirms, it will not follow that it has the ſame ſignification in this Phraſe. But *Æſchylus*, who was a very bold Poet, is no fit Author to be made uſe of in explaining the ſimple ſtile of St. *Paul*. And *Phavorinus* judged of the ſenſe of the word μορφὴ partly by the uſe of the *Peripateticks*, partly by the opinion of Divines, not by its vulgar acceptation. Μορφὴ δούλου really ſignifies *a ſervil Form* or *Appearance*, as we ſhall afterwards ſee. Theſe things could not be oppoſed to the perpetual uſe of the *Septuagint* and the Writers of the New Teſtament, according to which, as *Grotius* has obſerved, that word does not ſignify ſomething internal and ſecret, but apparent and viſible.

II. If that were the meaning of St. *Paul* in this place, which our Author after others ſuppoſes, the Apoſtle ſhould have expreſt himſelf thus: ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐκ ἡγήσατο ἁρπαγμὸν εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ὅμως ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε: *who being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be made equal with God, yet emptied himſelf.* And ſo ἐκένωσε, &c. would be oppoſed to all which goes before. But as the words now lie, it is oppoſed only to ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ εἶναι, *who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery, but*, &c. Which is all one as to ſay; *tho he was in the form of God, yet he did not think he might aſſume to himſelf an equality with God, but ſubmitted himſelf to his Will, and took upon him the form of a Servant*, &c. That this is the ſeries of the Diſcourſe, this the ſenſe of this place, was well underſtood by *Novatian* in Lib. *de Trinitate*, cap. xvii. whoſe words I ſhall not think much to ſet down. *Imitator omnium paternorum operum, dum & ipſe operatur ſicut & Pater ejus, forma, ut expreſſimus, eſt Dei Patris. Et meritò in forma pronunciatus eſt Dei, dum & ipſe ſuper omnia, & omnis creaturæ divinam obtinens poteſtatem, & Deus eſt, exemplo, Patris; hoc ipſum tamen a Patre proprio conſequutus, ut omnium & Deus eſſet & Dominus eſſet, & Deus ad formam Dei Patris ex ipſo genitus, atque prolatus. Hic ergo quamvis eſſet in forma Dei, non eſt rapinam arbitratus æqualem ſe Deo eſſe. Quamvis enim ſe ex Deo Patre Deum eſſe meminiſſet,*

niſſet, nunquam ſe Deo Patri aut comparavit, aut contulit; memor ſe eſſe ex ſuo Patre, & hoc ipſum quod eſt habere ſe, quia Pater dediſſet. Inde denique & ante carnis aſſumtionem, ſed & poſt adſumtionem corporis, poſt ipſam præterea reſurrectionem, omnem Patri, in omnibus rebus, obedientiam præſtitit pariter ac præſtat. Ex quo probatur nunquam arbitratum illum eſſe rapinam quandam divinitatem, ut æquaret ſe Patri Deo; quinimò contra omni ipſius imperio & voluntati obediens atque ſubjectus ut forman ſervi ſuſciperet contentus eſt. Being an imitator of all his Fathers works, and working alſo as his Father does, he is, as I have expreſſed, the form of God the Father. And juſtly was he pronounced to be in the form of God, becauſe he alſo being over all things, and having a divine Power over every Creature, is God after the example of the Father; yet ſo as to have obtained this Dignity from his Father, that he ſhould be God and Lord of all things, and to be God according to the form of God the Father, begotten and brought forth by him. And therefore tho he was in the form of God, he did not think it robbery to be equal with God. For tho he knew within himſelf that he was God of God the Father, yet he never compared himſelf with God the Father, being mindful that he was of his Father, and whatever he was, he was by his Father's Gift. And both before and after his aſſuming Fleſh, and after his Reſurrection, he yielded and ſtill yields all obedience to his Father in all things. Which ſhews that he never thought any Divinity robbery, to equal himſelf with God the Father; nay on the contrary, being obedient and ſubject to all his Commands and Will, he was content to take upon him the form of a Servant. This is the direct tendency of the form of St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, which will not admit of any other interpretation. And with this ſenſe all the words made uſe of by him agree, as I ſhall ſhew. But firſt of all it muſt be ſuppoſed that the Diſcourſe here is about the *Man* Jeſus, and not about the Deity, which is evident, to produce but this one Argument for it, from that which follows; for he *whom God hath exalted, and given him a Name above every Name, that in the name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow*, is undoubtedly the Man Jeſus, and not the Deity, which never received any thing, nor could receive any new Dignity; and he whom God ſo very highly exalted, is the ſame who had humbled himſelf, and ſuffer'd Death in obedience to the Will of his Father. This reaſoning, which yet is the ſum of the common Interpretation, is hardly tolerable. *The Divinity of Chriſt, tho equal* (yea numerically the ſame with the Divinity of the Father) *to the Father, humbled it ſelf to put on Humanity; wherefore, that Humanity received this Reward from the Father, to be raiſed to the higheſt pitch of Glory.* On the contrary, it is he that *humbled* himſelf, that St. *Paul* here

Chapter II.

Chapter II. here ſays was rewarded. This premis'd, I ſhall now explain the ſeveral Phraſes the Apoſtle makes uſe of.

III. Ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ is beſt of all interpreted by *Grotius*, of that Power which was obſervable in Chriſt, in ſo great a degree, that he could do whatever he pleaſed, wherein he came as near as poſſible to the moſt High God. The ſame thing is elſewhere intimated by St. *Paul*, where he ſays that Chriſt was the viſible *Image of the inviſible God*, Coloſſ. i. 15. For εἰκὼν & μορφὴ are ſometimes the ſame. *Heſychius*: Μορφὴ, ἰδέα, εἶδος, the word ſignifies a *form* or *ſpecies*. So *Suidas*: Μορφὴ, εἶδος, ἰδέα, σχῆμα, *a Species, Form*, or *Aſpect*. And *Phavorinus* hath the ſame. Whence μορφαὶ θεῶν among the Heathens, ſignifies the *Images of the Gods*; as in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus* de Romulo, Lib. 2. *Ant. Rom.* p. 90. ἱερὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ τιμίων, καὶ βωμοὺς, καὶ ξοάνων ἱδρύσατο, (μορφὰς) τε αὐτῶν καὶ σύμβολα —— κατεσκεύασατο: *he erected therefore their Temples, and Groves, and Altars, and the places of their carved Statues, and their* (Images) *and Symbols.*

IV. Οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο ſeems to be all one with οὐχ ἡγήσατο ἁρπακτὸν, that is, he did not think it a thing which he might ſnatch or raviſh to himſelf. So *Gregory Nazianzen* uſes the word ἁρπαγμὸς, in *Orat.* 1. againſt *Julian* pag. 67. where he ſpeaks of the Government's being uſurped by *Julian*: οὐκ οὖν ἁρπαγμα τύχης, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἆθλον, ἢ χειροτονία, ἢ ψήφος βασιλέως χαριζόμενος: *which not a rape or robbery of Fortune, but the reward of Vertue, or Time, or the ſuffrage of the King beſtows.* But the expreſſion of *Cicero*, in Latin, comes much nearer that of St. *Paul*; who in his V. *Orat. in Verrem*, ſpeaking of *Verres*, ſays: *Omnium bona prædam ſuam duxit, He thought every ones Goods his prey.* And in *Lib.* vii. Ep. 13. *ad Atticum*, ſpeaking of *Cæſar*, after *Pompey* had forſaken *Rome*, he ſays: *Huic tradita urbs eſt, nuda præſidio, referta copiis. Quid eſt quod ab eo non metuas, qui illa templa & tecta non patriam, ſed prædam putat? The City was delivered up to Cæſar, deſtitute of its Gariſon, and was filled with Souldiers. What is there not reaſon to fear from him who thinks thoſe Temples and Houſes, not his Country, but his Prey?* The Man Chriſt, tho he had received all Power both in Heaven and in Earth, yet ſaid in *John* xiv. 28. *That his Father was greater than he*, and would not ſuffer himſelf to be made equal with God. Contrary to what was done afterwards by *Simon Magus*, who truſting only to Magical Artifices, dared to equal, if not to exalt himſelf above *God*: See *Acts* viii. 10. and *H. Grotius* on that place. Which if our Author had but here thought on, without queſtion he would have greedily took up, to ſay that St. *Paul* here oppoſed Jeſus Chriſt to *Simon* the Patriarch of the *Gnoſticks*.

V. Τὸ

V. Τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, that is, to make himſelf equal with God. Which *Chriſt* openly profeſſes in *Joh.* v. 19. for after he had ſaid to the Jews, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; and the Jews thereupon ſought to kill him, *not only becauſe he had broken the Sabbath, but ſaid alſo that God was his Father, making himſelf*, as they affirmed, *equal with God*; ἴσον ἑαυτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ πατέρα τῷ θεῷ: Jeſus anſwers, that *the Son could do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſaw his Father do*; that is, that he only followed the Example of God, in which he ſhewed himſelf to be inferiour to him; for he that follows another's Example, and cannot depart from it, is inferiour to him who ſets the Example. But all this muſt be underſtood of the *Humanity* of Chriſt, and not of his *Divinity*. Chapter II.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. To keep to the Propriety of the Verb κενόω, it muſt be rendred thus: He behaved himſelf ſo, as if he were *void* of all that Power which he had received from his Father. He uſed it no more, than if he had not had it. Which muſt be underſtood only of thoſe times, in which *Chriſt* was to ſuffer any thing, either from the *Jews*, or from the *Romans*.

Ibid. Μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.] He did not really become a Servant, but, having taken upon him the form of a Servant, he ſeemed to be ſuch. For when *Chriſt* behaved himſelf towards the Jews and Romans, who vilified and loaded him with all manner of Injuries and Reproaches, as if he had been ſubject to their Power, like the reſt of the Jews, he truly *took upon him the form of a Servant*; that is, a ſervile Appearance. He did no more uſe that Power which he had received from God, and whereby he had wrought ſo many Miracles, and with which he was then endued as much as before, to defend or deliver himſelf, than if he had quite exhauſted it. It is known that among the Hebrews thoſe who obey, are called *Servants* עבדים *abadim*, and thoſe that are ſubdued by Power, are ſaid to become its Servants. They who underſtand theſe Words of the Divine Nature, interpret them of the Aſſumption of Humanity, becauſe Men are the Servants of God; which might be born, if any thing in the Context favoured their Opinion.

Ibid. Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος.] The Apoſtle does not ſay ἀνθρωπος γενόμενος, *being made Man*; which might intimate his Incarnation, and would be the ſame Phraſe with that in *Joh.* i. 14. but *he was made in the likeneſs of Men*; that is, was like other Men, who ſubmit to a Superiour Power, becauſe they cannot reſiſt it, and ſuffer themſelves to be ill uſed, when they are unable to defend themſelves. Chriſt was neither a Servant to the Jewiſh or Roman Magiſtrates, nor deſtitute of Power, to deliver himſelf from their Injuries and Cruelty; but,

Chapter II. but he behaved himſelf ſo, as if he were like the reſt of the Jews, and had nothing in him peculiar or extraordinary. The External Appearance of Chriſt at that time was μορφὴ δούλου, *the form of a Servant*; he was ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων, or, as the Jews ſpeak, כנגד בני אדם, chneged bne adam, *like the Sons of Men*, that is, χυδαίων ἀνθρώπων, *ordinary Men*; for ſo the Hebrew word אדם *adam* ſometimes ſignifies. I wonder here at *Grotius*, who interprets theſe Words, made like to the *firſt* Men, *i. e.* ſinleſs; which is a Phraſe without Example, and very diſtant from this place; where it is manifeſt the Diſcourſe is about the Humiliation of Chriſt. I know he puts a *Diaſtole* after λαβὼν, and makes theſe Words to begin a new ἀντίθετον, *oppoſite Member in the Diſcourſe*, but nothing can be more violent.

Verſ. 8. Καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος.] When the Jews and Romans perſecuted him, he was juſt like an ordinary Man in outward Appearance. This is the proper Signification of the word σχῆμα. *Heſychius*: Σχῆμα, πλάσμα, ἰματισμὸς, διάθεσις, κόσμος, [in the Latin it is printed κόμπος] *a Fiction, a Garment, Diſpoſition, Habit*, or *Ornament*: Σχηματιζόμενοι προσποιούμενοι, σχῆμα ὑποδεικνύντες, *counterfeiting, making a ſhew*, or *appearance*. The old Gloſſes: Σχῆμα, *figura, cultus, habitus, geſtus, geſtamen, forma*. And this is extreamly well oppoſed to *the form of God*, in which tho Chriſt appeared when he wrought ſo many and great Miracles; yet when he was abuſed and perſecuted by the Jews and Romans, he was like one of the Multitude, and put on no other appearance than belonged to any ordinary Perſon.

Here again I cannot but wonder at *Grotius*, who interprets theſe Words thus: *Dignitate talis apparuit qualis Adamus, id eſt Dominio in omnes creaturas, in mare, ventos, panes, aquam*, &c. *He appeared ſuch in Dignity as Adam, that is, with Dominion over all Creatures, over the Sea, Winds, Bread, Water*, &c. For *Adam* indeed had the uſe of all thoſe things which God had made, and which were within his reach; but he had not a Command over the Sea and the Winds, and every thing in Nature, like *Chriſt*. See my Note on *Gen.* i. 26.

Ibid. Ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν.] That is, in obedience to the Will of his Father, he ſubjected himſelf to all manner of Indignities, and Death it ſelf, no leſs than if he had been one of the meaneſt ſort of Perſons. He who had the command of the whole World, ſuffered himſelf to be deſpitefully uſed, and cruelly killed by wicked Men. This cannot in the leaſt be ſaid of the Divine Nature, and therefore nor that which went before. For ſuch a Diſcourſe as this would be intolerable: The Divine Nature of Chriſt condeſcended ſo low as to aſſume Humanity, and humbled it ſelf ſo, as to become obedient to the Death of the Croſs.

Croſs. The Divinity of Chriſt was not *obedient unto Death*, but his Humanity only, as all agree. And all that is in the ſame compaſs of Words, and the ſame *Antitheſis* ought to be referred to one and the ſame Nature, unleſs the undoubted Signification of Words, or the things ſpoken of require the contrary. Chapter II.

Ibid. Ταπεινωθεὶς ἀπήχθη μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.] In this part of his Humiliation, which was the greateſt, Chriſt might be ſaid in a ſpecial manner to have taken upon him the form of a Servant; the Croſs being, among the *Romans*, a ſervile puniſhment. See *Grotius*.

Ver. 9. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν.] This is the reward of the Humiliation which that Nature underwent that was obedient unto death; that is, the *Humane*. The Divine Nature cannot have any reward conferred upon it, which as it is never leſſened, ſo it is never exalted, or made greater.

Ibid. Ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα.] This is well interpreted by *Grotius*, of Chriſt's *Dignity*; for when a new Dignity is conferred, there is a new *Name* alſo conferred. St. *Paul*, who is his own beſt Interpreter, in *Eph.* i. 20. ſays: *He raiſed him from the dead, and ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every* NAME *that is* NAMED, *not only in this age, but in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet.* Where a *Name* that is *named* ſignifies a Dignity, as the foregoing words manifeſtly ſhew.

Verſ. 10. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ.] That is, not becauſe he is called *Jeſus*, as Dr. *Hammond* miſinterprets it; but, that all Creatures might reverence the man Jeſus, exalted to ſo high a dignity as to be God's Vicegerent. By his Redemption indeed he acquired to himſelf a power over all *men*, whom he made his own; but not over other intelligent Natures, who receive, properly ſpeaking, no benefit by the Redemption of Mankind. And therefore the Apoſtle has no reference here to the title of Redeemer, but of King, and one that was ſo even of the Angels, becauſe it ſo pleaſed God, no leſs than of Men.

Verſ. 11. Ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.] *Lord*, namely, of all things, excepting him that put all things under him. This is *the Name above every name*, which St. *Paul* before ſpake of, and not the name of *Jeſus*.

Verſ. 17. *Note* e. There is no doubt but St. *Paul* here has a reference to the pouring out of Wine upon Sacrifices, and compares his Blood alſo to Wine. And it is as undeniable, that the Faith of the *Philippians* is here conſider'd as a Sacrifice which the Apoſtle offered up to God. But what our Author ſays here beſides, are vain Niceties, which have no ground either in the uſe of the Greek Language, or the ſacred

Chapter III. Writers. It is falſe that θυσία ſignifies the ſlaying of a Sacrifice rather than the Sacrifice it ſelf, or a Sacrifice generally conſider'd: and as untrue is it, that λειτουργία ſignifies the Office or Action of the Prieſts and Levites in preparing the Sacrifice to be offered, rather than any other part of the publick Worſhip of God. So that θυσία καὶ λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως is nothing but a publick Oblation of the *Philippians* Faith to God: and thoſe two words ſignify one and the ſame thing; to wit, the Action of the Apoſtle publickly offering up to God the Faith of the *Philippians*.

Verſ. 20. I think the place in *Heſychius* needs no correction, unleſs perhaps inſtead of ἀντίσωκεν we ought to read ἀντισωκῶν, that is, *equal, in a balance of equal weight*; for ſo the Verb ἀντισωκόω ſignifies, as any Lexicons will ſhew, which I wonder our Author did not conſult.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 1. Ὀκνηρόν μοι here being ſubjoined to τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν, *Note* a. cannot otherwiſe be rendred, than *is not to me grievous*, i. e. *I do not think it grievous to write the ſame things*. It does not appear by any example, that ὀκνηρὸν ſignifies *cowardly*, or that which is a ſign of Fearfulneſs. Dr. *Hammond* did not well underſtand *Phavorinus*, whoſe words are theſe: Ὀκνεῖν, ἀντὶ τοῦ καὶ Ὅμηρος ὅτι τὸ ὀκνηρὸν ἔχων ἔταξεν, ἵνα ᾖ ὀκνεῖν τὸ μὴ ὀκνεῖν, ἤγουν μὴ ὀκνηρῶν, ἀλλὰ ἢ πλείων χρῆσις ἐστὶ μετὰ Ὅμηρον ὅτι φόβου ἢ ὄκνου τίθησι, καὶ ἐστι πολλὴ ἡ χρῆσις παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ: that is, *It muſt be obſerved, that tho* Homer *has put* ὀκνεῖν *for* ὀκνηρὸν ἔχων, *that is, not* ὀκνεῖν, *or not to labour; yet the more common uſe of thoſe who have written ſince* Homer, *is to put,* ὄκνος *for Fear, in which ſenſe it is frequently uſed in* Sophocles. See about this, *Euſtathius* p. 545. *Ed. Rom.* from whom *Phavorinus* borrowed this Remark.

Verſ. 2. *Note* b. It is much better to underſtand theſe things as ſpoken of the Jews, to whom *Grotius* applies them, who may be conſulted. For they who proudly called themſelves the περιτομὴ, are with reaſon ſtiled here κατατομὴ, that is, *the cutting* or *rending*, becauſe they rent aſunder the Church of *Chriſt*.

I. The paſſage which our Author cites out of the *Apocal.* ſhall be conſidered in its proper place. But from *Gal.* vi. 13. it does not at all appear that thoſe whom the Apoſtle there blames were not circumciſed; nay, the contrary may be inferred, as I have ſhewn on that place. It is ſtrange our learned Author ſhould cite the words of S. *Paul* ſo, as if he had expreſly ſaid that the *Gnoſticks* were οὐδὲ περιτεμνόμενοι, *not ſo much as circumciſed*; when the Apoſtle ſpeaks quite otherwiſe, as any one that looks into the place will ſee.

II.

II. The word καλλισμὸν belongs to those who were truly Jews, because those men κατατομὴν *cut asunder* the Christian Church, whilst they endeavoured to impose the Mosaical Rites upon the Gentiles, against their will. And such were justly call'd both *Dogs* and Schismaticks, who bark'd and snarl'd at all that refus'd to submit to the Jewish Yoke, and kept up Factions in the Church. See *Rom.* xiv. Chapter III.

Vers. 11. Εἴ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν.] By ἐξανάστασις here, tho set simply without any addition, must be understood a Resurrection to *a blessed life*; because tho the dead bodies of the wicked are to be restored to their former state, yet that Restoration is hardly worth the happy name of a Resurrection, which is succeeded by eternal death. Thus *Polycarpus* also speaks in his Epistle to the *Philippians*: Ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν (Χριστὸν) ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ, ἐὰν ποιῶμεν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα καὶ περιπατήσωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ: *He that raised Christ from the dead, will raise us up also, if we do his will, and walk in his commandments.*

Vers. 12. *Note* d. Tho S. *Paul* here uses several words taken from the *Agones*, and tho τέλεια ναυπήγια may perhaps signify the most noble and valuable Rewards; yet that τελειωθῆναι is an *Agonistical* term, I shall not believe till I see some place in an antient Writer, who in the description of an Ἀγὼν uses it in that sense. For it is not necessary to think that St. *Paul* keeps in every thing to the same Metaphor; nor can it be inferred from the phrase τέλεια ναυπήγια, that τελειωθῆναι is to attain to those Rewards, unless an example to that purpose be alledged.

I. I acknowledg that *Gregory Nyssen* calls the Death of a Martyr τελείωσις ἀθλητοῦ, but he does not therefore allude to the *Agonistical* way of speaking, in that word, as in the word ἀθλητὴς. Ecclesiastical Writers very often call Martyrs *Athletæ*, and the *Death* of Martyrs τελείωσις, and use τελειοῦσθαι to signify that they are dead; not that those three words are all by the same Metaphor taken from the *Agones*, but because they who had struggled under the Torments inflicted on them by the Heathens, were at length *consummated* by Death; that is, finished suffering all that they could suffer for the sake of Christ. The learned *Joan. Casp. Suicerus* has collected a great many examples of the words τελείωσις and τελειωθῆναι in these Acceptations, in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*. And the Latin Fathers frequently use the words *consummari* and *consummationem*, which without doubt are not *Agonistical* terms.

II. It is not probable that the Apostle *James*, in c. i. 17. had a reference to the Rewards of the *Agones*, because δόσις and δώρημα are not *Agonistical* names, signifying the Rewards of such as overcame. Of the passages alledged out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, I shall treat in that Epistle.

Chapter III. What our Author says about the word עקב is true; but S. *Chrysostom*'s Observation does not belong to that, but to the word נצח *netsabh*.

IV. St. *Paul* here uses the Verb τελειόομαι in a more general sense, not for Death, but *the attainment of Perfection*, from which men cannot fall into an unhappy condition; such as is the Perfection of the Saints, admitted into the mansions of eternal Blessedness. So that his meaning is this; that he had not as yet attained to such a degree of Holiness, as was perfect, from which he could not fall. We meet with this Verb used to signify *Perfection in Vertue*, in *Jam.* ii. 22. 1 *Joh.* ii. 5. and iv. 12, 13, 18. See also *Vers.* 15. of this *Chap.*

Ibid. *Note* f. That which was said of one of the Antients, *Nescivit manum de tabula tollere*, may justly be applied to our Author, who seldom knew when he had said enough about one thing. Because in some places he had some reason to think that the *Gnosticks* were referred to by the Apostles, therefore wherever there was but the least occasion for such a suspicion, the *Gnosticks* must undoubtedly be respected; as if all the Hereticks and wicked men that disturbed the Christian Churches at that time, had been *Gnosticks*. And so here, because there are some *Agonistical* terms used, he strains them all to the same Metaphor, and can see nothing in this place but Metaphors borrowed from the use of the *Agones*. The Verb καταλαμβάνω here may much more naturally be interpreted of that Action of Christ, when he suddenly καταλαβὼν *apprehended* S. *Paul* as he was persecuting the Christians in his way to *Damascus*, in order to make him an Apostle. But if any one will needs, with Dr. *Hammond*, have this to be an *Agonistical* word, I should not interpret it of the attaining a prize, but of *overtaking* or *catching*, viz. when a swift Runner overtook another that ran more slowly; as if Christ should be said to have run after St. *Paul*, and overtook him. *Suidas*: Καταλαβεῖν εἰρῆσθαι καὶ ὅταν τάχος ποδῶν ὄντων λέγωμεν, ὁ δὲ τὸ φεύγοντα διώξας καταλάβῃ: *The word is applied also to the swiftness of the feet, and therefore we say, such a one pursuing another that ran away, overtook him.*

Vers. 20. *Note* l. I. Our Author, in the beginning of this Note, puts *municipium* for *municipatus*; for *municipium* is the Town corporate it self, and *municipatus* the Privileges or Condition of *municipes*, *Free-men of any City or Corporation*. Which word *Tertullian* and S. *Jerom* make use of to explain this place, as learned men have observed.

II. But, the truth is, neither of these words belong to it; for no *municeps* could say, My *municipatus*, or *my municipium is in* Rome. *Rome* could not be called a *municipium*, which name belonged first only

ly to the Cities of *Italy*, but afterwards also to others, the Inhabitants of which were indeed *Roman* Citizens, but in their *municipia* were govern'd by their own municipal Laws, and not those of *Rome:* of which see *A. Gellius*, lib. xvi. c. 13. If we would describe the Condition of Christians by a Metaphor taken from the Condition of *municipes*, we ought to say, *that they have indeed a* municipium *on Earth, but their City is in Heaven.* Chapter IV.

III. I can't tell whether the place in *Cicero* was transcribed by our Author out of *Cicero* himself; but it's certain it is false quoted. For it is in lib. 2. *de Legg.* cap. 2. in these words; *Omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias; unam naturæ, alteram civitatis* (not *juris*) *ut ille Cato cum esset Tusculi natus* (not *exemplo Catonis qui*) *in populi Romani civitatem* (not *societatem*) *susceptus est.* If our Author wrote this passage out of *Cicero* himself, he was scarce awake; if he transcribed it out of another, he did not act prudently. [See Note on *Matt.* xiii. 54. where this place is cited by Mr. *le Clerc* upon another occasion.]

IV. Πολιτεία in *Acts* xxii. 28. does not signify *municipium* or *municipatus*, but the Privilege of the City of *Rome*. Besides, that word does not belong to this place; for no one would say, besides Dr. *Hammond* who abounds with improprieties of Speech, *our privilege of Citizenship is in Heaven?* Πολίτευμα here is all one with πόλις *City*, that is, *Patria* Country; ἡμῶν τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, that is, *our City or Country is in Heaven*, and not on Earth. Elsewhere πολίτευμα signifies the way of administring a Commonwealth. According to the twofold signification of the Verb πολιτεύειν, which is taken, for living in a City, or administring a Commonwealth, the word πολίτευμα has also the two alledged significations. But the former only can be admitted here, because St. *Paul* speaks of a *Place*, as appears by the *Preposition* ἐν, *in*; ἐν οὐρανοῖς, *in Heaven.* See *Heb.* xi. 13. and *seqq.*

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 3. *Note* a. OF this Phrase see my Note on *Deut.* xxxii. 32. where I have spoken of it at large, and confirmed what Dr. *Hammond* here says. But he produces imprudently a piece of a Verse as out of *Homer*, taking it upon trust, which is no where extant in him. At least as I never read it, that I remember, so neither can it be found by the help of *Seberus*'s Index. It is very ill done in any to alledg the Antients in such a manner, that the Reader cannot know whether they are truly cited: such Persons deserve never to be trusted.

Chapter IV. Verſ. 7. *Note* b. I can eaſily aſſent to what our Author here ſays; if we put but *Jews* inſtead of *Gnoſticks*, or if by the name of *Gnoſticks* we underſtand the *Jews* themſelves; becauſe tho it is certain there were *Judaizers* wherever the Jews were, it is not certain that the Heathen Sect of the *Gnoſticks* was ſo widely diſperſed. It muſt be further added, that νῦς does not ſignify only the *Mind*, but alſo frequently quickneſs of Wit or Underſtanding; whence νῦν ἔχειν is *to be ingenious*. *Heſychius* tells us, that this word ſignifies κρίσις, σύνεσις ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια, *properly, the action of a compoſed mind*, that is, a clear underſtanding of things. And ſo St. *Paul*'s meaning here will be, that the love of Peace was much better than all the Wit and Subtilty that the Diſturbers of the Church boaſted of.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Coloſſians*.

AT the end of the *Præmon.*] I. It may not be unuſeful to obſerve that *Coloſſæ* was even in antient Times a wealthy and populous City; as thoſe generally were which the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel went to, becauſe of the likelihood of having a greater harveſt in them than in others. *Xenophon* in *Lib.* 1. de *Exped. Cyri* ſpeaks of it in this manner: ἐξελαύνει διὰ Φρυγίας σταθμὸν ἕνα, παρασάγγας ὀκτὼ εἰς Κολοσσὰς πόλιν οἰκουμένην, εὐδαίμονα καὶ μεγάλην: *he led* (them) *through* Phrygia *one Station, eight Paraſangæ, to* Coloſſæ, *a populous, rich and great City.*

II. This Epiſtle ſeems to have been written in the ſame Year with the two foregoing, that is, according to the account of Dr. *Pearſon* whom I follow, *Anno Chriſti* lxii. and the ix*th* of *Nero.*

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 15. Εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀοράτου.] The word ὄντος muſt be ſupplied here after εἰκὼν, thus: *the* viſible *Image of the inviſible God*; which is to be underſtood of the Humanity of Chriſt it ſelf, as *Beza* well obſerves, who may be conſulted. But to the Humanity of Chriſt we muſt add the viſible Miracles which he wrought in the view of Multitudes. This is that which is otherwiſe called μορφὴ θεοῦ in *Philip.* ii. 6. Our Author ought to have expreſſed this more fully in his Paraphraſe.

Ibid. *Note* a. I. If we carefully examin the places brought by our Author and others, to prove that πρωτότοκος ſignifies ſometimes a *Lord*, we ſhall find them to be of no force. In *Pſal.* lxxxix. 28. *the firſtborn of the Kings of the Earth*, doth not ſignify *a Lord over other Kings*, but an *excellent* or *moſt glorious King*, as Dr. *Hammond* himſelf acknowledges, and the thing it ſelf ſhews. But *Job* xviii. 13.

makes

Chapter I. makes nothing at all to the purpose, for *the firstborn of Death* is not there *the Lord of Death*, but a mortal or deadly Disease. In the Civil Law, *Hæres* an Heir, does not signify properly *Dominus* a Lord; but *Justinian* tells us, that he who *pro Domino gerit*, represents or manages for a Lord, *gerit pro Hærede*, does the same for *an Heir*; and then he adds: *Veteres enim hæredes pro dominis appellabant: For the Antients used to say Heirs for Lords.* But hence it does not follow, that because the *Heir* was the First-born, therefore *the First-born of an Estate* may be put for an *Heir*, and so for the *Lord of an Estate.*

II. I think therefore with *Beza* and others, that by πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως is meant *he that was before all Creatures*; but I interpret πρωτότοκος just in the same manner as if St. *Paul* had simply said πρῶτος, laying no *Emphasis* at all on the two last Syllables τοκος, which come from the Verb τίκτω *to bring forth.* Because πρωτότοκος *a firstborn* is before the rest of his Brethren, therefore St. *Paul* calls Christ *the first-born of every Creature*, just in the same sense as if he had called him πρῶτος πάσης κτίσεως. This Interpretation the Apostle himself suggests to us, who explaining his own mind, says more clearly in *vers.* 17. he is πρὸ πάντων *before all things*; and in *ver.* 18. calls Christ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν *the first-born from the dead*, that is, πρῶτος ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *he that was first raised from the dead.* St. *Paul* proves that Christ was *before every Creature*, because *by him all things were created.* But no body in his wits ever dreamt that the Man Jesus was *before every Creature*; and therefore this must be understood of the Λόγος or *divine Reason*, the πᾶν πλήρωμα of which, as St. *Paul* afterwards speaks, *it pleased the Father*, ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικῆσαι, *should dwell in him.* See my Notes on *John* i.

III. I know that not only *Joan. Crellius*, and other *Unitarians*, but also *H. Grotius* interpret these things of the new Creation, and tell us that Christ is called here *the first-born of every Creature*, because he was the first and chief in the new Creation. But that is a forced interpretation, and remote from the most usual sense of the words, if we consider what follows. Besides, that in this place it should be said in the praise of Christ that he was before every new Creature, that is, before the Renovation made by himself, and this again proved by that Renovation, and repeated in *vers.* 17. is certainly flat and mean, when the thing is so evident of it self. Compare this place with *John* i. and see what I have there said.

Vers. 16. Ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.] I acknowledg that things are sometimes said κτίζεσθαι which *are constituted*, or *which have acquired a new State*, as *Grotius* has shewn in his *Prolegomena*

mena before the Gospels: So Men converted to Christ are called *new Creatures*, and the like. I have shewn also that κτίζειν signifies *colonis instruere*, *To furnish with Inhabitants*, on *Gen.* i. 1. But if we throughly examin this phrase of St. *Paul*, we shall easily perceive that those interpretations can here have no place. Christ is said here κτίσαι to have created all things in Heaven, which St. *Paul* afterwards interprets of *Angels*. Now, 1*st*. This cannot signify *to constitute* the Angels in Heaven which were already in it, and performed the same Offices as before. 2*ly*. Nor can the Angels be said to have been put into a new State, because nothing new befel them, but their becoming subject to the Man Christ; upon which account they can no more be said κτισθῆναι by him, than the *Romans* by *Julius Cæsar*, because he ruled over them with the title of Perpetual Dictator; that is, not without speaking very improperly. 3*ly*. Nor would it be any thing more proper to say that the Angels ἐκτίσθησαν, because Heaven received new Inhabitants into it. That these significations or any of them might be admitted, it should have been said ἐγένοντο ἐκτίσθησαν, and not the *Angels*, because we might then indeed think (if there was nothing in the Context to oppose it) that things in Heaven were disposed after a new manner, or that there was a certain use of it constituted and settled, or lastly, that it was furnished with Inhabitants; but that the Angels themselves, who were already in Heaven before the Man Christ, and discharged the same Offices, should be said to be created or *conditi made*, the use of the Holy Scriptures will not bear, nor the genius of the Hebrew or Greek Languages. I observe that the Learned do often err, in thinking that any signification which belongs to words when they are found separately, or in such or such a particular construction, may also be attributed to them in any construction whatsoever. But if the reading of the Antients did not, methinks the very genius of Modern Languages might teach them, that there is a great difference between the significations of words, according as they are joined with one another, and that the sense of Phrases is quite changed by the addition or alteration of one small Particle.

Chapter I.

To understand therefore the Apostle's mind, nothing can be here more fitly devised than this Paraphrase: Ὃς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἦν ἐφάνης εἰκὼν Θεοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ πρὸ Θεοῦ ἦν πρώτιστος πάσης κτίσεως. διὰ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα: *Who among Men was a visible Image of the invisible God, and was with God before all Creatures, for by him were all things created*, &c.

Ibid. *Note* b. I do not think the same words can be understood of Angels and Men, as if the several Orders among both were intended by the same Names. See *Grotius* on this place.

Ibid.

Chapter I.

Ibid. Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται.] *All things were created by him*, viz. *διὰ Λόγου, by the* divine *Reaſon*; *and for him*, that is, that the infinite Wiſdom of the divine Reaſon might be made manifeſt. See *John* i. and my Notes on the firſt 18 Verſes of that Goſpel.

Verſ. 20. *Note* c. This Interpretation is violent and forced, and tho agreeable enough to *Divinity*, quite contrary to *Grammar*, and therefore I think it is wholly to be rejected. For the queſtion is not, whether what Dr. *Hammond* ſays be true, but what the Apoſtle ſays in this place.

I. I acknowledg there is ſome agreement between *Epheſ.* ii. 14. & *ſeqq.* and this place, for in both the Redemption of Chriſt is ſpoken of; but that they are perfectly and in all things parallel, I utterly deny, and ſo will any one who does but read both places with any Application. And therefore this place ought not to be ſtrained, to agree exactly with that other.

II. This reaſoning of our Author is inconcluſive: *The Heavens and the Earth ſignify this lower World*; *this lower World is all one with Men*; *therefore all things in Heaven and Earth ſignifies all Men*, Gentiles *as well as* Jews. The parts of this Argument are falſe, and the conſequence illegitimate. *Firſt*, it is falſe that *Heaven and Earth* does any where ſignify merely this lower World, that is, the Earth and the Air lying round about it, excluſive of the upper ſpaces. For thoſe words are uſed to comprehend the whole Univerſe, not excepting the Starry Heaven, as appears by *Gen.* i. I confeſs *Heaven* often ſignifies the Air, but then it is not joined with the *Earth*, which muſt be carefully obſerved; for the uſual ſignification of an entire Phraſe is one thing, and of ſingle words another. *Secondly*, granting that the Phraſe *Heaven and Earth* ſignifies this inferiour World, it will not follow that *Men* are ſo called, nor indeed *are* they ſo ever. But *thirdly*, ſuppoſe that alſo were true, it muſt be obſerved that it is not ſaid here ſimply that *Heaven and Earth* were reconciled, but *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth*, which is a quite different thing; for in this phraſe, the Heaven and the Earth, are clearly diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who are in them; nor can the words *Heaven and Earth* be here thought ſynonimous to the name *World*, which often ſignifies Men. The Particle εἴτε *or*, which being twice repeated is a *Disjunctive*, ſhews alſo that *thoſe who are in Heaven*, are not the ſame with thoſe *who are on Earth*, and therefore that *Men* only cannot be intended. Beſides, tho the word *World* ſignifies all Men, and *Heaven and Earth* is called the World, it does not follow that Men may be ſignified by theſe words, *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth.* In interpreting Languages

guages it must not only be consider'd what may be said without absur- Chapter
dity according to Analogy, but with Analogy we must join use; I.

Quem penes arbitrium est, & lex, & norma loquendi.

Fourthly, hence it may be inferred, that what our Author adds about the Phrase πᾶσα κτίσις *every Creature*, is to no purpose, for it is certain *that* is often used to signify all Men; but that this other *all things both which are in Heaven and on Earth* signifies the same, appears by no example.

III. If *Eph.* ii. 16. ought to be corrected to Dr. *Hammond*'s mind, we should not change εἰς ἑαυτὸν into εἰς ἑαυτὸ, which would here signify nothing, but into εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ *into the same*: But there is no need of any correction. What follows makes nothing to the purpose; and as it does not help Dr. *Hammond*, so it does not hurt me.

IV. The reconciliation of Angels is not to be understood of a reconciliation with God, but with Men, who being God's *Enemies by evil Works*, were at the same time Enemies to the Holy Angels; which are so intimately allied to God, that the Friends and Enemies of the one are the Enemies and Friends of the other. But Men being once converted by Christ to a holy and religious Life, and made Friends with God, they become also Friends to the Angels, who love the good as much as they detest the wicked. Thus God has reconciled all things *into him*, that is, Angels and Men, acknowledging and worshipping one Lord Jesus Christ; made them Friends with one another, and composed one Family of both these orders of Creatures, who were before at a vast distance from each other, both in their Habitations and Dispositions. This is that which is signified in *Ephes.* i. 10. on which place see *Grotius*. It was a Mystery before unknown, that the time would come when τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, that is, *all the* Nations *upon Earth*, should become one Family with the Angels, as well as the *Jews*; that is, should own and worship the true God according to his own prescriptions, and so be accounted his Children. Which being so, what our Author alledges as out of that place in St. *Paul*, to confirm his interpretation of this, is insignificant.

Vers. 22. *Noted.* *Grotius* and others, much better interpret this Phrase of a *fleshly Body*, that is, obnoxious to the same Infirmities as ours. It is not true, that בשר signifies *Body*, tho our Author has several times affirmed it.

Vers. 24. Τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ.] That is, I that formerly persecuted the Church of Christ, do now on the contrary suffer many

Chapter II. evils for its advantage, and go on to ſuffer with undaunted conſtancy all that Chriſt has left me to ſuffer for his Church. So I have interpreted this place in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. S. 1. C. xii. where ſee what I have ſaid.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 8. *Note* b. I Eaſily grant that theſe Words ſignify Philoſophical Doctrines; but it does not appear to me that the *Gnoſticks* are here referred to. For why may not the Apoſtle have a reſpect to the Heathen Philoſophers, who had not a full and entire knowledg of true Vertue, but only ſome *Elements* of it? No body certainly can doubt but there were Philoſophers in all parts of *Aſia*, who might oppoſe the Chriſtian Religion; but it is not ſo eaſy to prove that the Followers of *Simon* were ſo univerſally diſperſed.

Verſ. 9. *Note* c. The Context ſeeming to require the ſenſe which our Author gives of this place, it is probable to me that στοιχεῖα ſignifies here indeed Elements, or Rudiments of Vertue; but that S. *Paul* alludes to another Signification of that Word, becauſe he oppoſes to στοιχεῖα, σῶμα θεότητος, *the Body of the Deity*. And that is when it is taken for a *Shadow*, of which Signification we have a clear Inſtance in theſe words of *Julius Pollux*, Lib. VI. c. 8. τῇ σκιᾷ δ' ἐπεμαίετο ἡ καιρὸν ἦν ὥρα τὸ δεῖπνον ὁδεῖν, ἣν καὶ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ ἐκάλουν. καὶ ἦν σπεύδειν εἰ δεήσοι τὸ στοιχεῖον εἴη: *they gathered from the Shadow when it was time to go to the Supper, which* [ſhadow] *they called* στοιχεῖον: *and it beboved them to make haſte if the* στοιχεῖον *was ten foot long*. This he took from *Ariſtophanes*, in whom a Woman is brought in ſpeaking thus, in *Concionat.* pag. 744. *Ed. Maj. Genev.*

——————σὺ δὲ μελήσοι
Ὅταν ἢ δεκάπους τὸ στοιχεῖον, λιπαρῶς χωρεῖν εἰς δεῖπνον.

Take care, as ſoon as the Shadow (on the Sundial) *is ten foot long, to go* [inſtantly] or *neatly to the Supper*. On which place the Scholiaſt has the ſame Obſervation with that I have ſet down out of *Pollux*. And hence perhaps the Repreſentations which are made to us in Dreams were called στοιχεῖα, becauſe they are as the obſcure Shadows of things. *Suidas*: Στοιχεῖα, αἱ εἰκόνες καὶ φαντάσεις τῶν ὀνείρων, αἱ δὲ ὀλίγῳ ἢ πολλῷ χρόνῳ τὴν ἔκβασιν ἔχουσι: *the Images and Fictions of Dreams, which in a ſhorter or longer time have their exit*. So that στοιχεῖα κόσμου, that is, an obſcure and faint Deſcription of thoſe Duties which Men ought to perform, or the groſs and rude Elements of Vertue, are very fitly here oppoſed πάντι πληρώματι θεότητος σωματικῶς κατοικοῦντι ἐν Χριστῷ, *to all the Fulneſs of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Chriſt*.

Verſ.

Verſ. 16. *Note* e. Tho I deny not but the Hebrew פרק may be rendred by μέρος, yet two things hinder my aſſenting to Dr. *Hammond*. *Firſt*, that the Talmudical Traditions were not written at that time, nor conſequently divided into Chapters. *Secondly*, that *to condemn in the Chapter of the Feaſt* is no Rabbinical phraſe, to ſignify the condemnation of a Perſon not obſerving what is taught in the Chapter of the *Talmud* concerning *a Feaſt*. What then is κείνειν ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς; I anſwer, it is an Elliptical expreſſion, the ſenſe of which is this, κείνειν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οὐ πίπτετε ἐν μέρει ἀγίων ἡμερῶν ἑορτὰς Ἰουδαϊκὰς, ἢ νουμηνίας, ἢ σάββατα, *becauſe ye do not reckon the Jewiſh Feaſts, or New Moons, or Sabbaths, in the place* or *number of Holy days*. So κείνειν ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει, is to condemn you becauſe you do not ſcruple eating, what the *Jews* thought it unlawful for them to eat or drink. It is a very noted Phraſe, τὸ πίνειν ἐν μέρει τινὸς πράγματος, *not to reckon in the place of any thing*, that is, not to think it ſuch, *or* the ſame. Of which *Henr. Stephanus*, or *Rob. Conſtantinus*, or any other Lexicographer will furniſh us with plenty of examples.

Verſ. 18. *Note* f. The word καταβραβεύειν, by Analogy, may have that ſignification which our Author gives it; but the following words do not favour it, which much better agree to the notion of *deceiving* than *condemning*. And indeed καταβραβεύειν may properly ſignify *to obtain the prize againſt another*, or βραβεῖον ἄγειν κατά τινος, and then by a Metaphor *to deceive*, becauſe the Prize which was due to another was often got by deceitful Artifices. *Suidas*: Καταβραβεύειν, καταλογίζεσθαι, καταγνώσεσθαι, καταγωνίζεσθαι· τὸ ἄλλῳ ἀγωνιζομένῳ ἄλλον στεφανοῦσθαι λέγει ὁ Ἀπόστολος καταβραβεύεσθαι: recenſeatur, *let it be recounted, let him condemn*, (perhaps it ſhould be read καταγνώσθω *let him be condemned*) *let him be overcome. The Apoſtle uſes* καταβραβεύεσθαι *to ſignify that when one ſtrives, another is crowned.* I believe inſtead of καταλογίζεσθω we ought to read παραλογίζεσθω, *let him be deceived*, for there is no Affinity between καταβραβεύειν and καταλογίζειν recenſere.

Ibid. *Note* g. The phraſe θέλειν ἐν τινὶ πράγματι, is without doubt a Hebraiſm; for the *Jews* ſay, חפץ בו *bbaphats bo*, that is, literally, θέλει ἐν αὐτῷ. But to ſpeak my thoughts, if there were any Authority to countenance it, inſtead of θέλων I ſhould willingly read the word with an addition but of one Letter ΘΕΛΓΩΝ, which yields an excellent ſenſe thus: *let no Man deceive you*, ENTICING or ALLURING *you by Humility and worſhipping of Angels*, &c. Nothing agrees better with *deceiving* than θελγόμενον *alluring*. But I am not for changing any thing againſt the conſent of the Copies.

Chapter II.

Chapter II. Verſ. 19. Πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ φθορᾶς ἀφῶν, &c.] I have explained this place, contrary to Dr. *Hammond*, on *Eph.* iv. 16.

Ibid. in *Note* i. pag. 658. col. 2. lin. 16. After the words *Advice or Opinion only.*] That which Dr. *Hammond* adds, in the end of this Note, after the words here ſet down, being an explication of ſome paſſages in the *Engliſh-Saxon* Councils, which cannot be underſtood by thoſe who are ignorant of the old Saxon Language, and is in it ſelf of little moment, I have omitted in my Latin Tranſlation. But inſtead of it I ſhall make ſome remarks on St. *Paul*'s words, and the foregoing part of the *Doctor*'s Annotation.

I. The words μὴ ἅψῃ, μὴ γεύσῃ, are very fitly referred to forbidden Meats; for Swines-fleſh could not be *touched* according to the Jewiſh Statutes, without pollution; and it was unlawful to *taſte* or eat ſeveral *other* ſorts of Meats which might be *touched* without Defilement. Or elſe, as *Grotius* thinks, theſe words might be rendred, *ne tangas ut veſcaris, touch not with a deſign to eat*, of which ſee my Note on *Gen.* iii. 3. The words μὴ θίγῃς I refer alſo to the ſame forbidden Meats. Tho the Verb θιγγάνω be uſed in places where another that ſignified *to come near* might have been uſed almoſt in the ſame ſenſe, it does not therefore follow that that Verb may be ſo rendred, or ſignifies juſt the ſame, becauſe *handling* is ſomething more than *coming near*; for one that comes near a thing does not therefore touch it, tho it cannot be touched without coming near it. The *Judaizers* often made uſe of theſe words, ſpeaking of thoſe Meats which were prohibited by the Law, *touch not*, *taſte not*, *handle not*; not all perhaps at the ſame time, or in the ſame order, but now one, and then another, juſt as it happen'd. So that it is no matter if the ſame thing be repeated, as long as they are different words, which were equally uſed to ſignify one thing.

II. The following words ἅ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει, are, I ſuppoſe, to be underſtood, with *Grotius*, of the corruption of Meats caſt out of the Body τῇ ἀποκρίσει (for ſo it muſt be read with ſome of the Antients) *by excretion*, i. e. by their being turned into excrements. To which there is a parallel ſenſe in *Mat.* xv. 17. In compariſon with this, our Author's interpretation is harſh and violent. For how could it be ſaid of the Meats from which the *Jews* abſtained, *which are abuſed to bring in abominable Luſts?* That agrees indeed to the Doctrine about the unlawfulneſs of Marriage, but by no means to abſtinence from Meats, which yet the *Doctor* would have to be alſo reſpected in the words immediately foregoing.

III. Τιμὴ does ſometimes undoubtedly ſignify a *Price*, or alſo a *Reward*, from τίω *to pay*; but τιμὴ σαρκὸς cannot therefore here be the *ſupplying of the*

the wants of the Flesh, because it is opposed τῇ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος to *pinching and not sparing the Body*. And so those who live an austere Life, and content themselves with mean fare, are very fitly said to live ἐν ἐν τιμῇ σαρκὸς, because they seem to give no *honour* to their Bodies. It is also a forced Interpretation of τιμὴ σαρκὸς to say that it signifies *Marriage* or *the honourable use of Marriage*, because the conjugal State is somewhere said to be τίμιος, *honourable*, and he that lives chastly, and does not pollute his Body with shameful Lusts, may be said ἐν τιμῇ σῶμα ἔχειν *to possess his Body in honour*. There must always be a regard had to places and construction, in finding out what words signify, and not any signification affixed to them in all places, as our Author sometimes does. Chapter II.

IV. In 1 *Thess.* iv. 5. all Copies read πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, not πάθει ἀτιμίας, and Dr. *Hammond* ought not to have produced his own Conjecture for the words of St. *Paul*, without an Admonition. See on that place.

V. I do not indeed condemn all ἐθελοθρησκία, as it is described by our Author; but I cannot perswade my self that St. *Paul* here uses that word in a good sense. When he says that the Life of those whom he condemns, had some λόγον σοφίας, he does not speak his own Sentiments, but the opinion of the Vulgar, who are more taken with those outward shews, than with true inward Piety. And I have this reason on my side, that according to the judgment of St. *Paul*, that *Humility* which consisted in the worship of Angels, had no appearance of Virtue in it; because to speak in the softest terms, it savoured something of Idolatry. The same may be said of ἀφειδία σώματος, which he declares *to profit but little*; which place I wonder Dr. *Hammond* would alledg, seeing it makes so much against him. But besides this, there is another reason which puts this matter out of all doubt, and that is, that the ἐθελοθρησκία here spoken of, is the worship of Angels, which was therefore unlawful because *voluntary*; it being unwarrantable to invent σεβάσματα *objects of Worship* to our selves, of our own accord, without a Command from God. Compare this *verse* with the 18*th*, where St. *Paul* speaks thus, *Let no Man seduce you in a voluntary Humility, and worshipping of Angels*; and there will be no doubt but the *voluntary Worship*, which the Apostle here speaks of, is the *worshipping of Angels*, it being manifest that he treats of the same thing in both places. So that ἐθελοθρησκία according to St. *Paul*'s notion of it, signifies something unlawful, tho the common sort of People who did not understand the nature of true Piety, admired such *voluntary* and affected *Worship*.

VI. But

Chapter II.

VI. But the caſe, as to the freewill-Offerings of the *Jews*, and the *voluntary Worſhip of Angels*, of which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks, was quite different. For God had commanded that Sacrifices ſhould be offer'd to him, and preſcribed the way in which they were all to be offered; ſo that all that was voluntary in thoſe Sacrifices, was the offering them up at ſuch certain times as the Supplicant of his own accord determined, according to God's preſcribed Rule, both as to the matter and manner. But God never commanded or permitted that religious Worſhip ſhould be given to any but himſelf and his only begotten Son; and much leſs has he preſcribed the manner how Angels ought to be worſhipped. So that there can be no compariſon between theſe two things.

VII. I acknowledg there may be ſome things good in themſelves, which yet may be omitted without Sin; but that therefore ἐθελοθρησκία here is taken in a good ſenſe, I do not think, becauſe θρησκία properly ſignifies religious Worſhip, which we may not give to any of our own accord. But the *Doctor* underſtood the matter here ſo, as if θρησκία ſignified either a lawful way of divine Worſhip, or any Action good in it ſelf, but not indiſpenſably commanded. And ſo indeed ἐθελοθρησκία may be taken in a good ſenſe: but the former, which I take to be the ſenſe wherein it is uſed by the Apoſtle, is a bad one.

VIII. After all, there are two things which ſeem neceſſary to be obſerved concerning all voluntary Actions relating to Piety; which if they be not conſider'd, this whole buſineſs will be very obſcure, and may be miſunderſtood.

Firſt, That under the Goſpel, to make any voluntary courſe or act of Piety acceptable to God, the matter about which it is converſant muſt be good in it ſelf, and ſuch as cannot be done but by a good man, and conſequently a better than thoſe who do not perform any ſuch Action: otherwiſe, if it be a thing indifferent in its own nature, and may be done by bad men as well as good, that voluntary Piety cannot be thought to pleaſe God. To preach the Goſpel with a pious deſign, and ἀδάπανον *without making it chargeable to the Hearers*, that ſo men might be the more eaſily perſwaded to the practice of Vertue, and brought to believe in Chriſt, was a thing good in it ſelf, and could not but be commendable in St. *Paul*, and acceptable to God. But to live a ſingle Life, tho chaſte, is a thing neither good nor evil, if it be oppoſed to a chaſte married Life; and may be found in a man that is proud, unmerciful, contentious, or imperious, and conſequently worſe than others who are married. And therefore that *voluntary Piety*, as it is called, cannot pleaſe God, whatever is ſaid by

by S. *Jerom*; who was not a whit the better for being a ſingle man. The ſame may be ſaid of all other things of the like nature. Chapter II.

The *ſecond* thing to be carefully obſerved in this matter is, that voluntary acts of Piety are commendable only in thoſe who obſerve what is indiſpenſably required, and not in thoſe who neglecting neceſſary and commanded Duty, as mean and trivial, would ſeem to aſpire to ſome higher degree of Piety. For what Maſter would be well pleaſed with a Servant, who omitting his expreſs Orders, ſhould ſet himſelf to do other things greater than he commanded him to do? All Maſters, and that with reaſon, expect their Servants ſhould do firſt what they require of them; and then, and not before, they may attempt to do ſomething extraordinary; otherwiſe they are offended with the pride and perverſneſs of thoſe Servants, who when they do not perform what is exacted from them, are yet vainly ambitious of appearing better than others. St. *Paul*, after he had done all thoſe things which became a good man and an Apoſtle, preached the Goſpel *freely*, to his great Commendation, and with the ſure hope of a ſpecial Reward. But if he had neglected plain Duty, or any eſſential part of his Apoſtolical Office, and pleaſed himſelf only with this, that he had preached the Goſpel without making it coſtly to his Hearers, he would not upon that account have been any thing the more acceptable to God. And ſo when we ſee that ſome of thoſe in antient times who ſhut up themſelves in Monaſteries, under a pretence of exerciſing themſelves in a more ſublime courſe of Piety, and being righteous above what is commanded, do manifeſtly diſcover a great deal of Pride, Hatred of their Neighbour, Impatience of Injuries, and the like Vices, in their Writings; he muſt be either ſtupid, or infected with the ſame Vices himſelf, that admires them, or thinks they were for that reaſon at all more pleaſing to God. Such alſo were the *Phariſees*, at leaſt for the moſt part, whom Chriſt ſo ſharply reproves, and whoſe ἐθελοθρησκεία I cannot but wonder that Dr. *Hammond* ſhould take in a laudable ſenſe. No one that reads the beginning of the deſcription of their Hereſy, in *Epiphanius*, can doubt but that word is uſed in a bad notion. The learned *Dion. Petavius*, tho a Jeſuit, preſently ſaw this, as appears by his Verſion of *Epiphanius*'s words, here ſubjoined: Ἐλέγοντο δὲ Φαρισαῖοι διὰ περισσότερόν τινα εἶναι αὐτὰς ὑπὲρ τὰς ἄλλας διὰ τὴν ἐθελοθρησκείαν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην: *Qui ideo*, ſaith Petavius, *Phariſæi dicti ſunt, quod eſſent, propter adſcititiam, ſuperſtitioſamque diſciplinam à reliquis ſejuncti*; *who were therefore called* Phariſees, *becauſe by their affected and ſuperſtitious Diſcipline they were diſtinguiſhed from others.*

Hence

Chapter III.

Hence it may be inferred in the *third* place, that those whose business it is to perswade men to Piety, have seldom need to recommend ἐθελοθρησκίαν to their Auditors, there being very few who perform necessary duties as they ought. These are the things which should be urged, and often inculcated; seeing, especially, they are of a vast extent, and frequently violated. Other things may be safely let alone, because those who are fit to be exhorted to works of Supererogation, are not only few in number, but do not need Exhortations to them.

IX. Sacrifices not commanded by God, and Holy-days, and other things of the same nature, not prescribed by any divine Laws, were in themselves neither good nor evil; nor could they be acceptable to God, any otherwise than as they were performed with a devout and affectionate mind: and therefore accurately speaking, it was not those voluntary acts of Piety, materially considered, wherewith God was pleased, but the devout Mind of those that performed them. Which was then only truly so, when, after they had done what was commanded them, they performed over and above those uncommanded things. The same may be said now of Ecclesiastical Rites, not prescribed by God, the observation of which can no otherwise, than upon those terms, be pleasing to him.

X. I wonder our Author should alledg the words of *Maimonides*, which have no manner of agreement with what he says; nay, are contrary to it. And yet he uses them elsewhere to the same purpose. See his Note on 1 *Cor.* ix. 17.

CHAP. III.

Vers. 14. IF the phrase *Bond of perfectness* were an *Hypallage*, it would signify *perfectness of Bond*, and not *a perfect Bond*. If we observe that S. *Paul* in the 12*th* Verse uses a Metaphor taken from Garments, and that the word ἐνδύσασθε there used must be repeated again in this, we shall easily see that he continues the same Metaphor: *And over all these things* [put on] *Charity, which is the bond of perfectness*. In which words, the Apostle alludes to a Girdle, which being put over our Garments, binds them fast together; and his meaning may be expressed in this manner: "After ye have put "on all other Vertues, over them put on Charity, which, like a Gir-"dle, may bind them fast together. So that τελειότης will signify here what it usually signifies; that is, a concurrence or consort of all Vertues; which wherever it is found, denominates a Christian τέλειον.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 5. Καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι.] That is, endeavouring to get time allowed by the Heathens for the ſpreading of the Goſpel, leſt it be oppreſſed in its firſt riſe, which it was poſſible for them to obtain by Prudence. See my Note on *Eph.* v. 16.

Verſ. 16. *Note* a. I. As to the thing it ſelf, I fully agree here with Dr. *Hammond*; yet I cannot but caution the Reader, that he ſhould not think the words he produces as out of the *Digeſt.* to be the very words of the antient Lawyers. Our learned Author did not look into the *Digeſta*, but tranſcribed the words of *Grotius* in his *Annot.* on the Inſcription of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, which he erroneouſly thought to be the ſame with thoſe contained in the *Digeſta*. *Grotius* his words are theſe: *Litteræ ejus ſunt, cujus tabellario ſunt traditæ, multoque magis ubi & redditæ ſunt.* L. *Si Epiſtolam* D. *de acquirendo rerum Dominio.* But *Labeo* in Lib. vi. *Pithan.* epitomized by *Paulus*, whoſe words are in *Dig.* Lib. xli. Tit. 1. S. 65. ſpeaks thus: *Si Epiſtolam tibi miſero, non erit ea tua, antequam reddita fuerit.* Paulus: *imo contrà, nam ſi miſeris ad me Tabellarium tuum, & ego reſcribendi cauſa litteras tibi miſero, ſimul atque Tabellario tuo tradidero, tuæ fient. Idem accidet in his litteris, quas tuæ duntaxat rei gratia miſero; veluti ſi petieris a me, uti te alicui commendarem, & eas commendatitias tibi miſero litteras. If I ſend you a Letter, it will not be yours before it is delivered to you.* Paulus: *Nay on the contrary, if you ſend me your Carrier* [with a Letter] *and I write another in anſwer to it, as ſoon as ever I deliver it to the Carrier, it becomes yours. And the ſame may be ſaid of a Letter which I ſhould ſend only on your behalf to another Perſon; as ſuppoſe you ſhould deſire me to recommend you to any one, and I ſhould ſend you that commendatory Letter.* Theſe words *Grotius* abbreviated, whoſe *Epitome* of them, the *Doctor* raſhly took for the words of the Lawyers themſelves. Yet hence it appears that *an Epiſtle of Laodicæa* may ſignify not only one written by the *Laodicæans*, but alſo one ſent to the *Laodicæans*. In the mean while, thoſe who deſire neither to be miſtaken themſelves, nor to deceive others, may learn by this example, not raſhly to believe other Mens Citations, nor to alledg Authors themſelves upon truſt.

II. Our learned Author ſeems as little to have look'd into thoſe places of *Tertullian*, where he ſpeaks of the Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*; for he

Chapter IV.

affirms expreſly, and does not only *ſeem to affirm*, that it was the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, whoſe Inſcription *Marcion* had changed. Lib. 5. c. ii. againſt *Marcion*. *Prætereo hic*, ſaith he, *& de alia Epiſtola, quam nos ad Epheſios præſcriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos. I forbear alſo to ſpeak of another Epiſtle which we have inſcribed to the* Epheſians, *but the Heretieks to the* Laodiceans. And cap. 17. *Eccleſiæ quidem veritate Epiſtolam iſtam ad Epheſios habemus emiſſam, non ad Laodicenos; ſed Marcion aliquando ei titulum interpolare geſtiit, quaſi & in iſto diligentiſſimus explorator. We of the true Church read that Epiſtle as directed to the* Epheſians, *not to the* Laodiceans; *but* Marcion *once thought fit to change its Title, deſiring in that alſo to be look'd on as a very diligent Critick.*

Verſ. 16. *Note* b. I. Every time almoſt that Dr. *Hammond* ſpeaks of St. *Paul*'s Bonds, he uſes the word *impriſoned*. As here ſpeaking of *Epaphras*, he ſays, *he was impriſoned at* Rome *with St.* Paul, and again, *fellow Priſoner with St.* Paul. But St. *Paul* was not impriſoned, but only bound in the ſame Chain with a Souldier, as the *Doctor* himſelf has ſhewn out of *Lipſius*, in a Note on *Acts* xxviii. 16. And perhaps he meant no more than that here, when he uſes the word *impriſoned*; but becauſe ſuch an improper Phraſe might lead his Reader into a Miſtake, it was not to be paſſed by without Cenſure.

II. I do not well underſtand how the *Coloſſians* ſhould here be exhorted to admoniſh *Archippus*, who had an Epiſcopal Authority over that Church, according to Dr. *Hammond*, with theſe words, *Take heed to the Miniſtry which thou haſt received in the Lord, to fulfil it*; unleſs perhaps *Archippus* be charged with negligence, and therefore is here commanded to be publickly reproved and admoniſhed by the whole Congregation. But it may be he was not the Biſhop of *Coloſſe*, but an *Evangeliſt*, who did not execute his Office ſo diligently as he ought; and lying idle among the *Coloſſians*, or ſomewhere in the Neighbourhood, was to be admoniſhed by them. Which ſeems the more probable, becauſe this *Archippus*, in the *Epiſtle* to *Philemon* ver. 2. is called *the fellow Souldier*, συστρατιώτης of St. *Paul*. On which place ſee *Grotius*.

Verſ. 17. Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.] *Grotius*, who is followed therein by our Author, thinks there is a *Hebraiſm* in theſe words for, *ſee that thou fulfil in the Lord the Miniſtry which thou haſt received*; ſo that the phraſe *in the Lord* ſhould ſignify, *according to the Precepts of the Lord*. But tho I do not deny but this may be the meaning of St. *Paul*'s words, they are capable of two other ſenſes:

firſt,

first, Consider throughly the Office which thou hast received in the Lord, in order to a complete discharge of it; or else, *secondly, Consider in the Lord,* that is, *as in the sight of the Lord*, or, *according to the Precepts of the Lord*, &c. So the Verb βλέπειν is sometimes taken, as in 2 *John* 8. βλέπετε ἑαυτὰς, &c. *See your selves that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full Reward*; that is, throughly consider or examin your selves, &c. Ἐν Κυρίῳ and ἐν Χριστῷ are all one, and according to the various significations of the Preposition ב, which is ordinarily rendred ἐν, and used in a manifold sense, signify diverse things. I confess I do not know which of these senses is the best. Chapter IV.

Vers. 18. Μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν.] The bare remembring of St. *Paul*'s Bonds being in it self no part of Piety, it is consequent the design of the Apostle in these words must be, to admonish the *Colossians* to behave themselves both towards God and towards him, as became those that were mindful of his Bonds; that is, who very well knew that he was cast into those Bonds only for the sake of the Gospel; or to be constant in the profession of the Christian Religion, as he was, and love him, and pray to God in his behalf, that he might be set at liberty.

ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*.

AT the end of the *Præmon.*] I. Dr. *Pearson* and other the most exact Chronologers, suppose this Epistle was written in the year of *Christ* lii. or the xiith of *Claudius*.

II. I have already several times observed, that the *Jews* were neither so formidable as our Author thought, nor the Christians so perfectly set free from persecution by *their* destruction throughout all the parts of the Roman Empire; so as that those who dwelt in *Greece* found the Heathens more favourable to them, after the overthrow of *Jerusalem*, and the excision of the *Jews*.

III. I do not easily believe what *Eusebius* says about the journey of *Simon Magus* to *Rome*, nor St. *Peter*'s contest with him, which seems to be all taken *ex Clementinis*, and out of *Justin*; the former being a feigned History, and *Justin* having run into a mistake through his ignorance in the Latin Tongue, as learned Men have long ago observed. I wonder our Author, in this discerning Age, in

Quo pueri nasum Rhinocerotis habent,

should build his Interpretation upon such rotten and nauseous Fables: But he produces, you will say, the Testimonies of *Eusebius* and St. *Jerom*, and *Orosius*. But this is but one Witness all this while, because the two latter only transcribed *Eusebius*; and the single Authority of *Eusebius* is not much to be regarded, because he often affirms things without considering whether they are true or false, and some that are manifestly feigned. It's true, *Justin* makes mention of the Statue of *Simon*, in his Apology, commonly called the *Second*; but he says nothing at all about St. *Peter*'s Conflict or Victory over him, which he would never have omitted, if that had been the general opinion of those times, because it might be made very great use of against the

the Heathens, whom he upbraids with deifying *Simon*. *Irenæus* alſo mentions the *Statue*, in Lib. 1. c. 20. but ſays nothing about the *conteſt*. That was but an invention of the *falſe Clement*, which others raſhly received for truth. There being very few, if any Hiſtorical Records in the firſt Age, excepting the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, Men that had nothing elſe to do, miſemployed their wits in deviſing Fables, which the injudiciouſneſs of Poſterity has almoſt made it a Crime to queſtion the truth of. But I am ſorry to find Dr. *Hammond* ſhould ſo eaſily give Credit to theſe Trifles. Chapter I.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 1. Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.] There are a few things which it may not be amiſs to remark upon this Chapter, tho Dr. *Hammond* has paſſed it over without any Annotations, contenting himſelf to expreſs what he thought to be the meaning of it in his Paraphraſe. *Grotius* explaining theſe words tells us, that the Apoſtle, *non nominat hic* Presbyteros & Diaconos, *quia recens erat Eccleſia, nec dum formam plenam acceperat*; *does not name here* Presbyters and Deacons, *becauſe the Church of* Theſſalonica *had been but lately gathered, and not yet formed into a regular Church*. But if this reaſon be good, none of the Churches to which St. *Paul* wrote, except that of *Philippi*, were *regularly formed Churches*; becauſe there is no mention made of Church-Governors, Biſhops and Deacons, in the inſcriptions of any of the Epiſtles, but to the *Philippians*. But who will believe that the *Epheſian* and *Corinthian* Churches, in which St. *Paul* had for a great while reſided, were not yet ſo conſtituted as to have Rectors in them; and yet that the Church of *Philippi*, in which he made a ſhorter ſtay, had? Of the Church of *Epheſus* the contrary appears from *Acts* xx. 17, 28. and of the *Corinthian*, by the Epiſtles themſelves written to that Church. So that there muſt be another reaſon given for St. *Paul*'s not making mention of *Biſhops and Deacons* in the Inſcriptions of all his Epiſtles. And that which ſeems to me the moſt probable is, that the Governors of the Primitive Churches were modeſt, humble Men, who were unwilling to have themſelves diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the People in the front of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, that they might not appear to pretend to any magiſterial Authority, but to look upon themſelves only as Miniſters inſtituted for the ſake of Order and Chriſtian Society. There are a great many ſigns of this, eſpecially in the Epiſtles to the *Corinthians*, in which the Governors of the Churches of *Achaia* are no where order'd to uſe any Authority in the Adminiſtra-

Chapter I. Administration of their Office, or in curbing evil Men who broke the Order of the Church. St. *Paul* every where speaks to whole Churches, never to the Governors of them apart from the People. However I would not be thought to deny, that some Churches were not yet compleatly formed when St. *Paul* wrote to them; in which number seems to have been the Church of *Rome*. But this of *Thessalonica* must be excepted, as appears from *Chap.* v. 12, 13.

Ibid. Ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.] That is, the Church of God and Christ. The *Jews* often pleaded that they were קהל אי עדת יהוה *Kehal o hedath Jehovah*, *The Congregation of the Lord*, a phrase not unusual in *Moses*, of which we have an example in *Num.* xvi. 3. Now to distinguish the Christians from the *Jews*, St. *Paul* calls *them*, not only the Church or *Congregation* of *God*, but of *Christ*. The Phrase ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι *to be in Christ*, is *to be a Christian*, and being subjoined to ἐκκλησία signifies a *Christian Church*, or *a Church of Christ*. See Note on *Rom.* xii. 5.

Vers. 3. Τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως.] The *Genitive* Case here signifies the relation of a cause to its effect; so that ἔργον πίστεως, is a *work* of which Faith is the cause, or such a work as can proceed only from Faith. Such was mens renouncing Heathenism, and totally forsaking their old Customs and Practices in order to embrace the Christian Religion, and regulate the remaining part of their Lives according to its Precepts; which could not be done but by those who believed *Jesus* to be truly sent from *God*, and gave the Apostles a Commission to preach what they did, and so the whole Doctrin of the Gospel to be true. About the ambiguous signification of a *Genitive* case, see what I have said in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. Sect. 1. C. xii.

Ibid. Κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης.] *Love* or *Charity* creates κόπον, that is, labour to a degree of *Fatigue*, when a Man loves his Neighbour so as to put himself to a great many Hardships and Troubles, and resolves to spare no pains whereby he may benefit others. Such was the Charity of St. *Paul*, who patiently underwent incredible difficulties in those long Journeys, to mention no more, which he made, that he might rescue multitudes of Men from eternal Destruction. And that the *Thessalonians* followed his example, as far as they could, he himself teaches us in this place.

Ibid. Τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος.] That *patience* of Adversities, which *Hope* produces, is never more remarkable, than when Christians are persecuted for their Religion, and submit to any Sufferings rather than comply with the demands of Heathens. For the *hope* of eternal Happiness makes them most *patiently* undergo the cruellest Torments.

The

The Apoſtle therefore here teaches us that from the three great Vertues of Faith, Charity, and Hope, proceed as all kind of good Works, ſo particularly an officious Diligence, which declines no Labour, and ſubmits to any Calamities whatſoever. Chapter I.

Ibid. Ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ.] That is, God looking on, as an *Agonotheta* or *Overſeer of the Games*, who confers a Crown on thoſe that exerciſe themſelves in Chriſtian Vertues, and perſevere in them to their lives end. The *Arabick* and *Syriack* ſeem to have omitted theſe Words, becauſe they could not connect them with the foregoing, when other Copies have them. But they might have been left out without diſturbing or altering the Senſe.

Verſ. 4. Εἰδότες — τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν.] That is, knowing and ſeeing that upon your embracing the Goſpel, God has actually diſtinguiſhed you from other People. See Note on *Eph.* 1. 4. They who rejected the Goſpel when preached to them, were not diſcriminated from other people, but lay buried ſtill among the unbelieving multitude of Mankind, as before.

Verſ. 6. Ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ.] Supply ὄντες; *having received the Word, which was in much affliction*, that is, the Preachers of which were grievouſly afflicted; *with joy of the Holy Ghoſt*, that is, with a pious chearfulneſs, preferring a good Conſcience and the hope of eternal Happineſs, to carnal Joy, joined with a courſe of Sin, and worldly Poſſeſſions.

Verſ. 7. Τύπους.] See what I have ſaid on this Word on 1 *Cor.* x. 7.

Verſ. 8. Ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ——— ἐξελήλυθεν.] *Beza* and *Grotius* think that οὐ μόνον muſt be prefixed to the Words ὁ λόγος, as if the Senſe ſhould be: *For from you not only ſounded forth the* Word of the Lord *in* Macedonia *and* Achaia, *but alſo in every place your* Faith *is ſpread abroad.* But if we carefully conſider theſe words, we ſhall perceive that the oppoſition here is not between ἐξήχησεν λόγου *the ſounding out of the Word*, and πίστις the *Theſſalonians Faith*, but between *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, which were parts of *Greece*, and *every place*, that is, all the places of the *Roman* Empire in which there were any Chriſtians. For the Diſcourſe aſcends in this manner: "The Goſpel is become famous not only in ſome Countries of *Greece*, by the means of your "Faith, whereof they have heard, but alſo through all the Chriſtian "Churches your Faith is ſpread abroad. *The Word of God* is ſaid to have *ſounded out* from the *Theſſalonians* in *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, that is, to have been made famous by their Faith. And this is what is meant by the ἐξέλευσις τῆς αὐτῶν πίστεως, the *going out of their Faith*, for *to go out* is to be ſpread abroad. See *Pſalm* xix. 4. and Interpreters.

Verſ.

Chapter II.

Verſ. 9. Ὁποίαν εἴσοδον ἔχομεν.] The *Alexandrian* Copy here reads ἴσχομεν *we had*, which is better than ἔχομεν, becauſe ἐπεγνώκατε follows, and the Diſcourſe is about a thing paſt: So that it *muſt* be read either ἴσχομεν, or εἴχομεν.

Verſ. 10. Τὸν μέλλοντα.] *Grotius* thinks this is the Preſent tenſe for the Future, but without any neceſſity; for he at *preſent* frees us from *the Wrath to come*, that ſets us upon ſuch a Courſe of Life, which if we conſtantly follow, we ſhall have no reaſon to fear that Wrath. Dr. *Hammond* thinks the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* is alſo here intimated; but I am not of his opinion.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I had rather retain here the uſual ſignification of the Word κενὸς, for *vain* or *light*. For St. *Paul* ſhews in the following Verſe, that it was not any Raſhneſs or Vanity that had put him upon preaching the Goſpel, which he himſelf did not believe to be true, in *Macedonia*: becauſe notwithſtanding the fierce oppoſition and deſpiteful uſage which he met with from the *Jews* at *Philippi*, he had conſtantly perſiſted in his Work. For raſh and vainglorious Men do indeed eaſily ſometimes undertake difficult things, but they as eaſily lay their Deſigns aſide, if they meet with any great difficulties in their way: But thoſe who have throughly conſidered things, and think, for very good reaſons, they ought to do that which they have undertaken, cannot be deterred by any Difficulties from proſecuting their firſt Purpoſe. They may apply to themſelves that Saying of *Æneas* to the *Sybil*, in *Virgil*, *Æncid. Lib.* vi. *verſ.* 102.

Non ulla laborum,
O Virgo, nova mi facies, inopinave ſurgit;
Omnia præcepi, atque animo mecum ante peregi.

Verſ. 5. *Notes* d and e. I. I eaſily aſſent to Dr. *Hammond*, interpreting the Word λόγος here by *talk* or *report*; for λόγος has often that ſignification, as *H. Stephanus* will ſhew. I ſee alſo that *Conſtantine* produces out of *Ariſtotle* the Phraſe ἐν λόγοις εἶναι, for *to be the Subject of mens Diſcourſe*; *hominum ſermonibus celebrari*. So that if St. *Paul*'s Words were to be rendred in *French*, in agreement with that Latin Phraſe, they would be rightly tranſlated thus: *nous n' avons jamais été en réputation de flatterie*: *We were never reputed to flatter.*

II. But

II. But I question whether he did not misunderstand the Words of *Phavorinus*, from which he endeavours to prove that προφασις signifies *an Accusation*; for wherever he renders αἰτία an *Accusation*, it might as well be rendred a *Cause* or *Plea*, whether true or pretended. For instance, *Phavorinus* saith, προφασις, χωρὶς ὁ προτεινόμενος ὑποκρίσεως λόγος, ἐπὶ κατηγορίᾳ τινὸς. καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἁπλῶς καὶ αἰτία: *the word προφασις is properly a specious Oration pretended in accusation of any one, but secondarily simply a Cause.* I am apt to think this must be understood of one that acts the part of an Advocate, and brings an Excuse in defence of his Client against his Plantiff; because the word προφασις in good Authors often signifies an *Excuse*, but never an *Accusation*. And the Defendant or accused Party is excused προφασει; that is, by a feigned Cause or Plea alledged to shew that he ought to have done as he did. His Fault is coloured over with a handsom name. Afterwards προφασις signified any *Cause*. This I am sure is agreeable to the perpetual use of Greek Authors. Besides, *Phavorinus* interprets the Verb προφασιζω in Latin by ἐξκύω *excuso*, which ought not to be changed, that being undoubtedly often the signification of that Verb. However, our Author seems to have understood the Words of St. *Paul* rightly as to the Sense of the Phrase, tho perhaps he did not perceive the full and critical importance of it, it being more probable that ἐν προφασει signifies in a pretence of *Covetousness*, and so the just meaning of the Apostle will be, that he never gave any man the least *pretence* or occasion to accuse him of *Covetousness*. So προφασιτικοὶ λόγοι in the *Septuagint* on *Deut.* xxii. 14. seem to be Discourses, wherein a Man seeks a *pretence* or *occasion* to put away his Wife, which agrees with the Vulgar Translation. And in *Dan.* vi. προφασιν ζητῶν is to *seek a pretence*, which the Conspirators might speciously use to destroy *Daniel*.

III. I have shewn on *Rom.* i. 29. that our Author is mistaken, wherever he interprets the word πλεονεξία *Lust*, and in this place he commits the same Error. St. *Paul* shews that he never gave any one the least ground to suspect him of πλεονεξία, or *Covetousness*, in vers. 6. and 9.

Vers. 6. *Note* f. To denominate Letters βαρεῖαι *weighty* or *severe*, it is not necessary they should *threaten Excommunication*; for there may be weighty, *i. e.* severe Letters, which have nothing in them about Excommunication. Besides βάρος no where signifies Excommunication, or any thing like it; and much less can the Phrase ἐν βάρει εἶναι be interpreted *to excommunicate*, according to the use of the Greek Tongue, either in Profane, or even in Sacred Writers. Ἐν βάρει εἶναι, as *Grotius* and others well observe, is the same with ἐπιβαρεῖν, in *ver.* 9. It is opposed

Chapter III. posed to ὕπνοι γινόδαι, becauſe he that rigidly or ſeverely exacts his right is ἐν βάρει, *burdenſom*, but he that recedes from it, ὕπνος. If the *Doctor* had thought of theſe things, he would not have look'd here for Church-cenſures without any example: but it was his failing to be more inquiſitive after them than he ſhould be, which made him think he had diſcovered them ſometimes where they were not.

Verſ. 19. *Note* k. Στέφανος καυχήσεως is a Crown of which any man *boaſts*, not in which he rejoices; for tho thoſe things are often joined, yet they are not to be made the ſame, unleſs we would equal Dr. *Hammond* in impropriety of Speech.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 10. Ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον.] I am apt to think there is a tranſpoſition in theſe Words, and that they muſt be put into this order: δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ: *praying that we might ſee your face, as that which would* overflow our heart with joy, or *would be a ſuper-abundant cauſe* of joy to me. St. *Paul* was not ſatisfied to know that the *Theſſalonians* ſtedfaſtly adhered to the Goſpel, tho the news of that was matter of very great joy to him, but he deſired ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, *over and above* to ſee them. Ἐκ περισσοῦ ſignifies ſomewhat, which if not ſuperfluous, is at leaſt unneceſſary, and abounds, and therefore cannot fitly be joined with δέησις Prayer, which is always neceſſary: And with the addition of ὑπὲρ it ſignifies an *overflowing* or *exceſs*, which by no means agrees with a neceſſary Duty. That this is the force of that Particle appears by *Eph.* iii. 20. where St. *Paul* ſays that God is able [ὑπὲρ] πάντα ποιῆσαι [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν, *to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.* So likewiſe in this Epiſtle to the *Theſſal.* c. v. 13. *We beſeech you* — ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, i. e. *to love them with a ſuperabundant love.* So that it is better to refer this word to that which St. *Paul* prayed for, than to his Prayer it ſelf. See an inſtance of the like tranſpoſition in *ver.* 7. of which there are a great many in St. *Paul.*

Ibid. Τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.] The word πίστις here muſt not be underſtood of an aſſent of the Mind yielded to the Goſpel, which was as *perfect* in the *Theſſalonians* at that time as it could be, of which their conſtancy in ſuffering Perſecution for Religion was a clear evidence; but *Knowledg*, which might be increaſed by further Inſtruction. For St. *Paul* had not tarried long at *Theſſalonica*, nor had time enough to teach them perfectly all that concerned the Chriſtian

Chriſtian Religion. So the word πρ᾽ος is taken in *Rom.* xiv. 23. where ſee my Note.

Chapter IV.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. WHat our Author ſays here out of *Barnabas* and the *Jews*, he took from *Grotius*, except the interpretation he gives of the word כוס *chos*; which never ſignified an *Inſtrument*, but only *a Cup*: Nor is there any ſuch affinity, as he contends, between that word and the Greek σκεῦος, either in ſound or ſignification.

Verſ. 6. *Note* b. All that our Author here ſays does not perſwade me to believe that κατέχειν or πλεονεκτεῖν are to be referred to *fleſhly Deſires*, contrary to the uſe of Scripture, and all other Greek Writers. For,

I. What he infers from the Series of this place, he would plainly have perceived to have been of no force, if the *Gnoſticks* had not ſtood in his light, and like a Cloud hinder'd him from ſeeing the thing as it is. The Apoſtle here teaches us that there are two ſort of Vices to be eſpecially ſhunned; the luſts of the Fleſh, and an inordinate deſire of other mens poſſeſſions: The former in *verſes* 3, 4, 5. in theſe words: *This is the Will of God, your Sanctification, that ye ſhould abſtain from Fornication; that every one of you ſhould know how to poſſeſs his Veſſel in Sanctification and Honour, not in the luſt of Concupiſcence, even as the Gentiles which know not God.* The latter in *verſ.* 6. where he ſpeaks thus: *And that no man go beyond, or overreach his Brother in* any *matter, becauſe the Lord is the avenger of all ſuch, as we alſo have forewarned you, and teſtified.* Then he ſubjoins the ſpecial reaſons of both theſe Injunctions; of the former in *ver.* 7 and 8. and of the latter in *ver.* 9. which ſhews that the *7th verſe* muſt not be immediately connected with the *6th verſe*, as it is by our Author, but with the *5th verſe*, and the *9th* with the *6th*. That this *may* be the order of the Diſcourſe is undeniable, and that it not only may, but really is ſo, every one will think, who knows that the Verbs κατέχειν and πλεονεκτεῖν never ſignify what Dr. *Hammond* would have them. And we ought not to impoſe an unheard of ſignification upon theſe words, becauſe of the Series of the Diſcourſe, when the order of St. *Paul*'s reaſoning is clear without it. Of the Verb πλεονεκτεῖν and the Noun πλεονεξία I have ſpoken on *Rom.* i. 29.

Chapter IV. II. As to the Verb ὑβρίζειν, the places alledged by our Author do not prove that word to signify the practice of unnatural Lusts. The last Verse of *Hesiod*'s Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμ. shews that ὑβρισταὶ signifies *Sins* or *Transgressions*, but that is nothing to Dr. *Hammond*'s purpose. The place in *Phocylides* must be set down more correctly and at large.

——————— μηδ' ἀρ' ὑβρίζῃς,
Πάντων μέτρον ἄριστον, ὑβρίσματα δ' ἀλγεινά.

Do not transgress, of all things a mean is best, and Transgressions are grievous. Where the Discourse is about breaking into another man's Ground, as appears by the words immediatly going before.

Ἀγρῷ γείτονος ἀντὶ ὑπάλλου ————————

Abstain from thy neighbour's Field. But what is this to Sodomy or unnatural Filthinesses? The place cited out of *Hesychius* proves nothing, because ὕβεις there is rather taken for an Injury joined with contempt, ὑβρίζειν signifying *praecellere, superare, to outgo, to surpass*, and ὕβεις being afterwards interpreted in *Hesychius* by ὑπερηφανία. What our Author adds about the Verb ῥαίνω and its Derivatives, or Compounds, does him as little service: for the signification of a simple Verb, or of some of its Compounds, does not necessarily pass to all the rest; and there is no example brought by the *Doctor*, where ὑβρίζειν τινὰ signifies to commit filthiness with him.

III. Besides, the annexed Words ἐν τῷ πράγματι & ἀδελφὸς shew that St. *Paul* did not so much as dream of that sense, which our Author here affixes to his words. For no body ever said in Greek ὑβρίζειν ἐν τῷ πράγματί τινα, to signify an act of Uncleanness; and, if St. *Paul* had so meant, he would not have said τὸν ἀδελφὸν, that is, a Christian, but μηδένα *no man*, for it was as bad to commit that Sin with Heathens as with Christians.

IV. Nor did ever any one say, in that signification, πλεονεκτεῖν τινα ἐν πράγματι; and I wonder how any Expositor could differ here as to the sense from *Beza*, who interprets these words: *Nequis opprimat aut habeat quæstui in* ullo *negotio fratrem suum: That no man oppress or make a gain of his Brother in* any *matter.* Consult himself and *Grotius* on this place. Πλεονεκτεῖν signifies *to make a gain of* in 2 *Cor.* vii. 2. and xii. 7, 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. OUR Author here, as in many other places, meerly ſerves an *Hypotheſis*, and forces every thing to a compliance with his own opinion.

But I. Why may not we think that St. *Paul*, after he had ſpoken of the laſt coming of *Chriſt* in the concluſion of the foregoing Chapter, paſſes here to the time of it, not as to another thing, but as another circumſtance of the ſame thing; ſo as alſo to ſpeak in this place about the laſt coming of *Chriſt*? The *Theſſalonians* lamented the condition of thoſe who died under Perſecutions; and therefore St. *Paul* in the end of the laſt Chapter comforts them with the proſpect of an endleſs Reward, which ſuch perſons were to receive at the coming of *Chriſt*; and here he adds, that there was no need of his writing to them about the time when that ſhould be, becauſe it would come on a ſudden, and when it was leaſt expected, as *Chriſt* himſelf had more than once ſaid. Which can be underſtood only of his final coming. For tho the Siege of *Jeruſalem* might perhaps be ſudden and unexpected to the *Jews* who lived in that City; yet it was an eaſy matter for others to conjecture that ſome great calamity was like to come upon them from the *Romans*, for their perpetual ſeditions and unruly tempers. *Joſephus* has ſhewn at large in Lib. ii. *of the Jewiſh War*, that the indignation of the *Romans* againſt the *Jews* was not preſently ſtirred up. But thoſe eſpecially, who were diſperſed through the *Roman* Empire had time enough to know that the *Jews* were upon the point of utter ruin, when they ſaw *Judea* laid waſt by the *Roman* Armies. Beſides, the *Jews* who lived out of *Paleſtine*, as thoſe who were diſperſed through *Greece*, did not periſh by any ſudden Deſtruction, in which they involved the *Gnoſticks*; but only thoſe who took up Arms againſt the *Romans*, as the *Antiochians*, *Cyrenians*, and ſome others. I know indeed the *Jews* ſuffer'd very great Miſeries under *Adrian*, in the Iſle of *Cyprus*; but our Author will not have the time of *Adrian* to be here referred to, nor did thoſe Calamities befal them on a ſudden. It is not probable that the *Gnoſticks*, who had no true Zeal for the Jewiſh Religion, and who, as the Doctor often tells us, complied with the Jews to eſcape being accuſed by them before the Roman Magiſtrates, did yet conſpire with a handful of that Nation againſt the whole Roman Power.

II. Our

Chapter V.

II. Our Author ſuppoſes that a conſtant Faith and holy Life would be an infallible means to preſerve the Chriſtians, which as I acknowledg to be moſt true, underſtood of *eternal Salvation*, ſo I do not believe it true, if underſtood of a Deliverance from the Perſecutions of the *Romans*. For could not the *Gnoſticks* feign themſelves to be Heathens, and do ſacrifice to their Gods, that they might not be accounted *Jews?* And that, if I am not miſtaken, was abundantly enough to cauſe a diſtinction to be put between them and the Circumciſed, eſpecially if the *Gnoſticks*, as our Author thinks, were not real *Jews*. Beſides, the Chriſtians in *Greece*, whilſt the *Romans* were incenſed againſt the *Jews*, did not eſcape the fury of the Magiſtrates becauſe they were *Chriſtians*, but becauſe they were not *Jews*, and were look'd upon as peaceable Men, who were not for making any diſturbance in the Government. I wonder our learned Author did not ſee theſe things, but ſo often ſerves himſelf of an Hypotheſis which he never attempted to prove by Hiſtory.

Verſ. 10. *Note* b. Our Author goes on to faſten his own Conjectures upon St. *Paul*, without any regard to Grammar.

I. It is true indeed, that *to live* may ſignify to be in proſperity, and there are ſeveral examples of the word taken in that ſenſe, as our Author has ſhewn on *Chap.* iii. 8. of this *Epiſtle*; but that *to live with Chriſt* has ever any ſuch ſignification, Dr. *Hammond* will never prove without examples, to any that underſtand Greek, or are acquainted with the ſtile of Scripture. Whatever a word ſignifies alone, it does not ſignify in conjunction with others. Whatever is meant by it in one place, it cannot ſignify in all. In this place, *to live with Chriſt* does not only include the notion of eternal Life, but ſignifies nothing elſe, as the bare reading of the Verſe ſhews: *who died for us, that whether we wake or ſleep, we might live together with him.* Can Chriſt be ſaid to have died for the Chriſtians of *Theſſalonica*, that they might not periſh in that deſtruction which was to come upon the *Jews*, but ſurvive them? Where does the Scripture mention any ſuch end of the Death of Chriſt? Dr. *Hammond* did not think fit to ſay ſo much as this in his Paraphraſe, where he does not expreſs the words of St. *Paul*, but what he himſelf thought.

II. But Chriſt having died for Men, that they might live with him, *i. e.* that they might enjoy eternal Life with him in Heaven, and that being the ſenſe of the Apoſtle's words, the next thing to be conſider'd is, what is meant in this place by *waking or ſleeping*. And becauſe St. *Paul* ſays that neither of theſe things ſignifies any thing to Salvation, for *whether we wake or ſleep* we ſhall live together with Chriſt; thoſe

those Phrases cannot be thought to signify either a *Vice* or a *Virtue*, contrary to what they do in *vers.* 6, 7, & 8. Our Author who thinks the Discourse is about a temporal Deliverance, interprets them of *Sollicitude* and *Security*; which I cannot admit, because I affirm that the Discourse is about eternal Salvation, as the thing it self also declares. What therefore do they signify? why this, and nothing else, Whether we are still alive, when he shall come to judg the Living and Dead, or whether we die before that time. As in *Chap.* iv. 13, 14. κοιμηθέντες, *those who were asleep*, are they who shall be dead at the coming of Christ: so here those who shall be awake, signify them which shall be found alive at that time, as *Grotius* well observes, whom our Author ought to have followed. What the *Doctor* says in this Annotation besides, I have already confuted. Chapter V.

III. Yet there is one thing perhaps that may be objected in favour of Dr. *Hammond*, viz. that St. *Paul* seems to speak of a thing which was to come to pass in his time, because he exhorts the *Thessalonians* to watch, in *ver.* 6. lest they should be found in Darkness at the day of the Lord's sudden Coming. But God having not revealed the day in which he will judg Mankind, so much as to his Son *Jesus Christ*, whilst he conversed in this World, but only said that it would come on a sudden, and when it was least expected, with a design, seemingly, to keep Men from delaying their Repentance, while they hope to have time enough to repent before that day comes; it is no wonder that St. *Paul* here speaks of the last Judgment, as a thing which was to happen in his Age. He could not speak otherwise, seeing God had not revealed the thing more clearly. To which purpose it must be observed that he does not deny but that the Judgment was deferred, in which there would have been a manifest Error, but only teach the *Thessalonians* that Men ought to be always prepared, for fear of being surprized by the sudden coming of *Christ*. I know indeed Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphrase of the 2*d Verse*, represents the Apostle as saying that the Coming of *Christ* was not far off; but if we read St. *Paul*'s words, we shall see that he only teaches that it would be sudden and unexpected, not that it was near at hand, or shortly to be. For it is compared to the coming of *a Thief in the Night*, in which nothing but the τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον or *unexpectedness* of it is considered.

Vers. 12. *Note* c. The word προϊστῶντας may much more simply be interpreted to signify the Governors of both Orders in the Church, who may be comprehended under the common name of προεστῶτες, as being all set over the Church of *Thessalonica*, tho not with an equal Authority. Considering this is grounded upon the proper significa-

Chapter V. tion of the word, it may much more eaſily be admitted, than that there were more Epiſcopal Churches in *Macedonia* beſides that of *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*, which were contained under theſe as their Metropolitans. See my Note on *Philip.* i. 1.

Verſ. 22. *Note* e. Our Author rightly interprets the words of St. *Paul* in this place of *all kind of Evil:* for after the Apoſtle had ſaid, πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε, *prove all things, hold faſt that which is good*; it very fitly follows, *abſtain from all kind of evil*; which is all one as if he had ſaid: When ye have carefully examined all that any Prophet ſhall ſay to you, be ſure to embrace and retain whatever you find to be good, but reject all that is evil. As τὸ καλὸν does not ſignify that which has an appearance of good, ſo πᾶν εἶδος πονηρὸν, which is ſet oppoſite to it, is not every appearance of Evil, but all that is really Evil. That εἶδος is often taken for *kind*, there is no need of proving. But if any doubt of it, they may conſult the *old Gloſſes* of *Labbæus* his *Edition*, on the word εἶδος.

Verſ. 23. *Note* f. I. This in earneſt is a medly of inſignificant places, and for the moſt part foreign to the words of St. *Paul*, in which the firſt thing liable to cenſure is, that our Author here follows the old way of Philoſophizing, which in this particular is certainly falſe, there being nothing in a Man but his Body and reaſonable Soul, which Soul is moved by Affections ariſing from the Body, without the intervention of any third Faculty, as learned Men have long ago ſhewed, even before this was publiſhed by Dr. *Hammond:* And that Soul alone, not any inferior Nature, is the ſubject of τὸ αὐτεξούσιον or Free-will. It is ſtrange that wiſe Men, in order to know what is in Man, that is, in themſelves, ſhould go and conſult *Plato* or *Ariſtotle*, as if they were enquiring into the nature of a living Creature, which *they* only had ſeen, and we knew nothing of, and make it their buſineſs to repeat what Men of little accuracy have ſaid about a thing, which every one may much better underſtand of himſelf.

II. It is falſe that any ſuch thing can be deduced from the Hiſtory of Man's Creation, as it is ſet down by *Moſes*. For tho it be ſaid that God *formed Man out of the Duſt of the Earth*, by which words is meant his Body, yet he is not ſaid to have added two other parts to him, for *Moſes* proceeds thus *verbatim: and breathed into his Noſtrils the breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul*; or as I have rendered it in more proper terms, *ſpiritumque vitalem in nares ejus flavit, atque homo animal factus eſt*; *And breathed into his Noſtrils a vital Spirit, and Man became a living Creature.* Which words ſignify only, that God put Life into Man's Body which he had faſhioned out of the Duſt; and properly

perly ſpeaking, contain nothing about an immortal and reaſonable Soul; tho there is no doubt, but that God, together with Life, infuſed *that* alſo into Man's Body. The diſtinction of the *Rabbins* between *the breath of Life* נשמת חיים, and *a living Soul*, נפש חיה is grounded neither upon the Phraſe it ſelf, nor any Scripture example, tho it is alledged on this place by *Grotius*. However it muſt be acknowledged, that we may conſider in the nature of Man his Body and Soul as two diſtinct parts; and then his Life, not as another part or effect of ſome third Principle, but as a certain affection of the Body; and that to this St. *Paul* ſeems to have had a reſpect, ψυχὴ being very frequently taken for *the Life*. And ſo the Apoſtle will be underſtood to pray for the *Theſſalonians*, that God would preſerve their Bodies, Spirits and Lives *unblameable*, which he calls *their* ὁλόκληρον, or all that was in them, and indeed there is nothing elſe to be found in Man. Chapter V.

III. I acknowledg alſo that the *Soul*, in the old Teſtament, is ſometimes taken for the *Will*, but *Gen.* xxiii. 8. is in vain alledged to that purpoſe. Where the Hebrew has: *if it be* [*with*] *your Soul that I ſhould bury*, and not, *if it be your Soul*; as our Author has it out of the Engliſh Tranſlation, which renders only the ſenſe, not the words. And the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* does not render the word *Soul* by a word which ſignifies *Will*, but the whole Expreſſion, *if it be your Soul*, by this entire Phraſe, *if there be a will in your Soul*, אם רעוא פשכון. All choice or will is in the Spirit, but the Spirit is ſometimes divided between carnal Affections and the Law; ſo as on the one hand to ſee what it is obliged to, and on the other to be held by Pleaſure and the luſts of the Body. For all that our Author has here heaped together, I would not give one ruſh.

IV. The only difficulty is, wherein conſiſts that *preſervation* by which God is ſaid to keep the Spirit, Life and Body *blameleſs unto the coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. Thoſe three not being of the ſame nature, they cannot be ſaid in the ſame ſenſe to be preſerved *blameleſs*. The *Spirit* is *blameleſs* when it is not perverted by any pernicious Error, or defiled with any habit of Sin. The *Life* may be ſaid to be blameleſs in a peculiar manner, conſidered ſeparately from the Spirit and Body, when it is kept without diſſembling or revolting from the Chriſtian Religion; in which reſpect fearful Men incurred *Blame*, who to ſave their *Lives*, either diſſembled or renounced the Faith. Laſtly, the *Body* is *preſerved blameleſs*, in a particular ſenſe, when it is not polluted by the enjoyment of any unlawful Pleaſures. But theſe all making up the τὸ ὁλόκληρον ἀνθρώπου, neither ought nor can properly be conſidered ſeparately, becauſe they are conjunctly de-

Chapter V. filed and incur *blame*. And the reaſon why St. *Paul* mentions them ſeverally, is not becauſe he would have them conceived as diſjunct, but only that he might deſcribe the whole Man the more diſtinctly.

V. As for the words ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου *unto the coming of the Lord*, they muſt be underſtood thus: That when Chriſt comes ye may be judged *blameleſs*, that is, ſuch as according to the tenour of the Goſpel-Covenant, cannot be accuſed before *Chriſt*. So that it is as if St. *Paul* had ſaid: εἰς τὸ ἀμέμπτους εἶναι ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, that *ye may be blameleſs when Chriſt comes*; ſo as that your *Spirits* may neither be upbraided with dangerous Errors, or vitious Habits, nor this charge brought againſt you, that you once redeemed your Lives by diſſembling or Apoſtacy, nor, in fine, that you polluted and profaned your Bodies with ſenſual Luſts. Many periſh by one of theſe three things, but no Man is ſaved but by a conjunction of all the contrary Vertues.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Second Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] This Epistle is referred by Dr. *Pearson* to the Year of *Christ* LIII, or the XIIIth of *Claudius*, at which time St. *Paul* still remained at *Corinth*, after he had been in vain accused by the Jews at the Tribunal of *Gallio*. Of the occasion on which it was written I shall speak on the Epistle it self.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 5. *Note a.* WHat the Christians said about Christ's coming to punish the *Jews*, might possibly expose those of them that lived in *Judea*, to the Fury of that Nation; but in *Greece*, or other remote Provinces of the *Roman* Empire, that the Christians were persecuted particularly upon that account I do not believe; so as that St. *Paul* could say that the *Thessalonian* Christians *suffered ὑπὲρ τὸν μελλόντων παθεῖν Χριστόν*. The *Roman* Magistrates did not so much befriend the Jews, especially out of *Judea*, as to afflict the Christians because they portended that the seditious *Jews* would ere long be destroyed by the *Romans* themselves. Of which we have a manifest instance in *Gallio*, *Acts* xviii. 12, & *seqq.* And it appears no less from profane Writers, that the *Jews* were not at that time in favour with the *Romans*. *Tiberius compescuerat, had restrained* not only the Egyptian but *Judaicos ritus, the Jewish Rites*, as we are told by *Suetonius* in the Life of *Tiberius*, *Cap.* xxxvi. *Judaicumque juventutem, per speciem Sacramenti, in provincias gravioris cœli distribuit, reliquos gentis ejusdem, vel similia sectantes urbe submovit, sub pœna perpetuæ servitutis; and distributed the Youth of the Jews, under the pretence of a military Expedition, into Provinces of an unwholsom Air, forbidding*

Chapter II. *the rest of that Nation, or any that were of the same Sect, to make their abode in the City, upon pain of perpetual Slavery. Claudius* also, a very little while before the writing of this Epistle, *Judæos, impulsore Christo,* as the same Author speaks in the Life of *Claudius, cap.* xxv. *assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*; that is, I suppose, *cast the Jews, disagreeing among themselves about Christ or the Christian Religion, some standing up for it and others opposing it,* [upon which account Christ may in some sense be said to have been the impulsive Cause of their Banishment] *out of the City.* This might be confirmed out of *Philo* and *Josephus*; but the thing is so clear that it needs no further proof.

Vers. 7. *Note* b. Whatever our Author here says, all these things may much more fitly be understood only of the last Judgment; of which see *Grotius* and other Interpreters. Tho St. *Paul* speaks of the Judgment, as of a thing near at hand, it does not follow that it is not the last Judgment which he speaks of; because, not knowing the time when that was to be, he was obliged to speak of it as of a thing not afar off, that so the Christians might be always ready, considering Christ might come when he was least expected.

CHAP. II.

Vers. 1. *Note* a. I Have shewn, on the former Epistle, that the places which our Author applies to the Destruction of the *Jews*, may very well be understood of the last Judgment. And what St. *Paul* says here, being written on occasion of what he had said before, must be referred to the same coming of Christ.

Ibid. *Note* b. As the παρουσία, or *coming* of Christ, both in the *first Epistle* to the *Thessalonians* and this, is his final coming to judg the living and the dead; so also ἐπισυναγωγὴ ἐπ' αὐτὸν signifies, as *Grotius* has well observed, the gathering together of good men to him, that they may be made Copartners with him of eternal Happiness in Heaven. See *Mat.* xxv. 31. Our Author should have produced an Example in which ἐπισυναγωγὴ εἰς Χριστὸν signified *to be assembled for the Worship of Christ.*

Vers. 2. *Note* c. All that our Author here says may as fitly agree to those, who through a misapprehension of St. *Paul*'s Words should have thought that the end of all things, and the coming of Christ to judg the World, was at hand. And so there is no need of recurring to any other coming of Christ.

Vers. 3. *Note* d. I. To speak the truth, I confess none of the various Interpretations which I have read of this place, fully satisfy me:

me: But as I can easily find something to object against others, so there is nothing which I can propose my self as certain. The Interpretation which our Author prefers before all others, is grounded only on this supposition, that there was a vast number of *Gnosticks* before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, who were destroyed together with that City; which he has no where solidly proved. When the Christians are admonished not to believe Impostors, it is not necessary to understand it as a Caution to them to avoid the Errors of the *Gnosticks*; for there were a great many *Jewish* Impostors, which *Josephus* makes mention of in the History of that Age, and there might be many more which he passes by. It does not appear by any certain account that all or most of the *Samaritans*, who had embraced the Christian Faith, fell off to the Heresy of the *Gnosticks*. Our Author has not so much as *attempted* to prove this; and indeed it would have appeared by the Vanity of such an Undertaking, that he had not carefully enough examined the Histories of those Times. See my Note on his following Annotation. Chapter II.

II. Tho I acknowledg I can think of nothing here which may be satisfactory, I shall however propose to the Reader a Conjecture, which seems so much more probable than either *Grotius*'s or Dr. *Hammond*'s. And that is, that by ἀποστασία the Apostle means that great and famous Defection of the *Jews*, when they endeavoured, tho to no purpose, to shake off the *Roman* Yoke. This Christ in *Mat.* xxiv. foretold before the *end* should come, first of the Jewish Commonwealth, and then of the whole World; and by this the Christians might know that the end was not at hand, because that ἀποστασία had not yet happen'd: For the beginning of the Jewish Rebellion was about the end of the Reign of *Nero*; of which see *Lib.* ii. *de Bello Judaico cap.* 30. according to the Division in the *Greek*. And such a *defection* is often called ἀποστασία or ἀπόστασις. *Josephus* in the same Book, *cap.* 31. represents the chief of the Jews as τῷ τόλμαν τῆς (ἀποστάσεως) χαλεπήναντας, *being offended with the boldness of the defection*; and a little after it is said of *Agrippa*, that he was willing κελεύειν ἀφειμένον *to spare the Rebels*; and in *cap.* 33. the seditious are said ἀποστάντες Ῥωμαίων, *to have revolted from the Romans*. The same Words frequently occur afterwards in that signification in *Josephus* and other Writers. The *old Glosses* have Ἀπόστασις *rebellio, segregatio, abitus, defectio:* Ἀποστάσια *discessio, discidium:* Ἀποστάτης *rebellis, rebellio, transfuga.*

Ibid. *Note* e. I. I acknowledg that ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτίας, tho in the singular number, must be understood to signify not one Man, but a Multitude, who yet were to be headed by some one notorious Villain, to whom this and the like Characters should of special right belong. Nor do

Chapter II. I deny but *Simon Magus* deſerved to be thus ſignalized, or rather branded, but I do not believe it is he whom the Apoſtle here has a reſpect to; nor is there any certain Hiſtory which relates all that is ſaid of him by Dr. *Hammond*, or agrees with his conjectures. It is affirmed firſt by *Euſebius* out of *Juſtin*, that *Simon* went to *Rome* under the Reign of *Claudius*, ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος, which our Author interprets of the beginning of the Government of *Claudius*, becauſe it ſeemed to agree better with his conjectures. *Juſtin*, and out of him *Euſebius*, ſay that *Simon* was accounted a God, and that a Statue was erected to him as ſuch. In which learned Men have long ſince ſhewn that *Juſtin* was miſtaken; and it may be probably conjectured that that Journy of *Simon* to *Rome* was a Fiction of ſome ignorant Man, who had not a due regard to Truth, and miſunderſtood the Inſcription of that Statue. At leaſt that St. *Peter* came to *Rome* in the time of *Claudius*, there are very important Chronological Reaſons to disbelieve, tho I do not doubt but he came into that City, and ſuffer'd Matyrdom in it, under the Reign of *Nero*. *Juſtin* further adds, σχεδὸν πάντες Σαμαρεῖς, that *almoſt all the Samaritans* worſhipped *Simon*; but perhaps he ſpeaks *hyperbolically*, perhaps *Juſtin* relates a thing which he was not ſure of, who wrote all whatſoever he heard without making any difference. That which he ſays about the *deifying* of *Simon* is alone enough to ſhew, that he is not an Author, whoſe bare Affirmation may be ſafely truſted. And hence perhaps *Irenæus* would not poſitively affirm *a Claudio Cæſare ſtatua honoratum propter magiam*, that [Simon] *was honoured with a Statue by* Claudius Ceſar *for his magick*; but prefixed to this Story *dicitur*, *it is reported*. What our Authot ſays about his concealing himſelf, and contending with St. *Peter*, is taken *ex Clementinis*, and unworthy of any credit. The reſt which he relates concerning his Followers ſhould have bin particularly proved by the teſtimonies of good Authors; becauſe it is the ground of what he ſays here about the *revelation* of the *Gnoſticks*, and that being uncertain, the other muſt be ſo too. Any one may eaſily deduce what Interpretations he pleaſes out of feigned Circumſtances.

II. Now to give my own opinion concerning the *Man of Sin*, ſeeing I have interpreted ἀποστασία of the Rebellion of the Jews, it follows that the ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτίας muſt be the rebellious Jews themſelves, and eſpecially their Ringleader *Simon*, not the *Magician*, but the Son of *Giora*, ſpoken of by *Joſephus* towards the end of his 2*d* Book of the *Jewiſh War*, and afterwards often: Which *Simon* gathering together a Company of Robbers in the Lordſhip of *Acrabatena*, began to play the

the Tyrant, but first more secretly; till at last despising the Authority of the chief men of the Jewish Nation, he violated all Laws both divine and human in *Jerusalem* it self, as *Josephus* in the following Books declares at large. And that such a man, or any who were like him, should be called ἄνθρωποι ἁμαρτίας, is not strange. Chapt II.

Ibid. Ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας.] *A son of Perdition* is one that deserves to be destroyed, or is condemned to Death, as our Author well observes; and how properly this Title belonged to *Simon* and his Companions, *Josephus* will inform us, who in *Lib.* vi. c. 36. speaking of all the People [of the Jews] observes that, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ τῇ πατρίδι λαῷ [καταιτίαται] καὶ πάσαν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίας ὁδὸν εἰς [ἀπώλειαν] ἀποτρέπων: *It was God, who had condemned all the People, and turned all means of safety into Destruction.* And in *Lib.* vii. c. 7. speaking of *Simon* himself, after he had related how he shewed himself out of a Vault under ground, where the Temple had stood, and was taken by the Romans, he says, Σίμωνα μὲν ὧν εἰς δίκην ὧν κατὰ τῶν πολιτῶν ἁμάρτων, ὃν πρῶτος αὐτὸς ὑπεφύλαττεν, ὑπὸ τοῖς πολεμίοις μισοῦν πραγμάτοις ἐπέπεσεν ὁ Θεός, ὃ βίᾳ γενόμενον αὐτοῖς ἑκουσίως, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκείνοις εἰς τὴν τιμωρίαν παραδιδόντα, δι' ὃ πολλοὺς αὐτὸς αἰτίως ἀπέκτεινε, ψευδεῖς ἀρχὰς ἐπιφέρων ἐπὶ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μεταβολῆς. οὐ γὰρ διαφεύγει πονηρία Θεοῦ χόλον, οὐδὲ ἀδικούσῃ δίκη. χρόνῳ δὲ μᾶλλον τοὺς εἰς αὐτὴν θρασυνομένους καὶ χεῖρα τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐπιφέρει τοῖς τοιούτοις, ὅτι καὶ ἀσεβοῦσιν αὐτῆς ἀπολλάττεται, μὴ θᾶσσον κολαζόντως: *God therefore delivered up* Simon *for the punishment of his Cruelty towards the Citizens, over whom he had bitterly tyrannized, into the hands of his greatest Enemies, not taken by force, but throwing himself of his own accord upon punishment (God so ordering it) because he had cruelly put a great many [others] to death, bringing false Accusations against them, of a defection to the Romans. For Wickedness can never escape the Vengeance of God, nor Justice ever be enfeebled, but early or late it overtakes those that bid defiance to it, and inflicts a heavier punishment upon the Wicked, because they expected to be delivered from it, not being presently punished.* He suffered in the *Publick place* at *Rome*, as this Writer tells us in *Cap.* xvii. of the same Book according to the division in the *Greek*. By this it appears how fitly those wicked men might be called ἄνθρωποι ἁμαρτίας and υἱοὶ ἀπωλείας. And that the rest of the characters contained in the following verse do as well agree to them, shall be distinctly shewn on each.

Vers. 4. Ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν.] These Words express the extream Wickedness of men, and their marvelous Insolence towards Governours, proceeding from an incredible Zeal for Innovations. For he is truly called ἀντικείμενος an *Adversary*, *viz.* of God, who has no more regard to his Laws, than if he industriously opposed and fought against him with all his might, and

Chapter I. endeavoured to deſtroy his Worſhip, and root his Fear out of the minds of men. And ſuch were *Simon*, *John*, and *Eleazer*, and the reſt of the Captains of the Seditious, whoſe horrible Impieties *Joſephus* often mentions, openly charging them with *Atheiſm*. See the laſt *Chapter* of *Book* vi. where he ſays that that *Generation* of men was πολὺ ἀθεωτέρα *much more impious* than any of thoſe who for their Wickedneſs were ſwallowed up by the Earth, or deſtroyed by the Flood, or periſhed by Lightning. Magiſtrates or Governours are called alſo Gods, as every one knows. And theſe ſeditious men roſe up in great fury, both againſt the Rulers of the Jews, ſuch as were the Prieſts, and againſt the Romans; for they killed the former, and waged an obſtinate War with the latter, as *Joſephus* throughout his whole Hiſtory relates. See particularly about the *Prieſts*, *Cap.* xviii. *Lib.* iv.

Ibid. Ἡ σέβασμα.] I am apt to think St. *Paul* added this word κατ' ἐπεξήγησιν, *by way of Exegeſis*, that the *Theſſalonians* might the better underſtand what he meant by πᾶν λεγόμενον θεὸν, for the Hebrew אלהים which is rendred Θεὸς, properly ſignifies σέβασμα, as coming from the old root אלה *alah*, which at this very day among the Arabians ſignifies to *honour* or *reverence*, σέβειν. And there could not be a fitter Greek word choſen to expreſs the ſenſe of the Hebrew; for σέβειν ſignifies as well that Honour which is due to Magiſtrates, as to God. So it is uſed by *Charondas* in *Stobæus* Serm. xlii. χρὴ περὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας εὔνοιαν διαφυλάττειν, καθάπερ πατρικὴν, εὐπειθοῦντας αὐ [σεβομένους] *We ought to bear as good a will to Rulers as to our Parents, ſubmitting our ſelves to them, and reverencing them.* But the ſeditious Jews were ſo far from reverencing the lawful Authority both of their own Countrymen and Strangers, that on the contrary they thought themſelves ſuperiour to them, killing all the chief men among the Jews, and acting in a hoſtile manner againſt the *Romans*.

Ibid. *Note* g. I. Ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is not, in the ſtyle of St. *Paul*, ſimply ναὸς, any *Temple*, but the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, which alone was ſo called. This appears by the doubling of the Article, nor can thoſe words, in any Jewiſh Writer, be ever underſtood otherwiſe. The Jews would not allow the Temple of *Garizim* that title, which they look'd upon as no better than a *Temple of Idols*.

II. Our learned Author here pays a greater deference to the Authority of *Juſtin Martyr* than he need; for why might not he be miſtaken in this, who erred in ſo many other things? Did not the ſame man make *Herod* to be contemporary with *Ptolomæus Philadelphus* and the *Septuagint*? Did not he ſay that the word *Satanas* was compounded of *Sata* and *nas*, tho he was diſputing with a Jew, who could eaſily

ſily refute ſuch a miſtake? Did not he very unjuſtly and falſly, and yet with no ſmall confidence, accuſe the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures? And could not he who erred ſo groſly in theſe things, not to mention any more, raſhly take an occaſion from the inſcription of a Statue, which he miſunderſtood, to ſay what was not true? He was a Martyr, what then? Are Martyrs infallible, or to be believed when they are manifeſtly miſtaken? And if they have been deceived in ſome eaſy things, and are not to be credited in all, why might not they be miſtaken in matters of greater difficulty? Beſides, this Inſcription, if it be underſtood of *Simon Magus*, is contrary both to the uſe of the Latin Tongue and the Cuſtom of the *Romans*, nor is it at all countenanced by the Hiſtory of that Age. In Latin there is none ſo called, abſolutely *Deus Sanctus*, beſides *Semon* or *Simon* (if we chuſe ſo to write it, tho corruptly) an unknown God of the *Sabins*, or *Hercules*, as *Lilius Giraldus* will inform us in *Hiſt. Deorum*. And it was not the cuſtom of the Romans to erect Statues to private men, and that before their Death, ſuch as *Simon* the *Samaritan*, as to Gods; nor can any one inſtance to that purpoſe be produced out of all the Roman Hiſtory. And if ſo unuſual a thing had been done by *Claudius*, whoſe Folly ſo many Writers have recorded, there would be ſome mention made of it by the Heathens, whereas there is not the leaſt mark or ſign of it any where to be found. But, ſays our Author, if *Juſtin* had been miſtaken, or wrote what he knew to be falſe, the Emperors to whom he wrote, would eaſily have diſcovered the Cheat. But the Emperors perhaps did not ſo much as look into the *Apologeticks* of *Juſtin*, it may be which was their ignorance or wickedneſs; they laughed at them, and deſpiſed every thing elſe that was good in them, becauſe of this error. And who can doubt, if there was ever any *Tripho Judæus* in the World that ſhould have read his Dialogue, or any other Jew whatſoever, but he would have ſcorned, and that juſtly, what *Juſtin* upbraids the Jews with, as to the corruption of the ſacred Writings, which in a modern Author would be called a Calumny. The bare authority therefore of *Juſtin* is not to be regarded. Chapter II.

III. But it is confirmed by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*. I have anſwer'd this in part already, by obſerving that *Irenæus* premiſes before this Story the word *dicitur*, *it is ſaid*, which ſhews he was not confident of the truth of it, but only declares what ſome others reported. And *Tertullian*, as thoſe Apologetick Writers uſed to do, did but tranſcribe thoſe that went before him, never minding or examining whether what they ſaid was true; and out of him again this Story was taken by the later Writers of the Church of *Rome*: but that theſe

Chapter II. took any great care, not to affirm any thing concerning former Ages, but what was certain and unqueſtionable, no one will believe that reads their Writings with his eyes open.

IV. But if *Simon Magus* be not the Perſon here deſcribed, who is it, you will ſay, that is thus characterized? I anſwer, Thoſe wicked *Zelots* and *Edomites* who forcibly poſſeſſed themſelves of the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, and ſo ſettled themſelves in the place of God's peculiar reſidence, in which they behaved themſelves very proudly and inſolently, deſpiſing all the Laws of God, filling the Temple with the blood of the Citizens, and profanely uſing the holy things of it as their own; as *Joſephus* in many places tells us. Firſt, the *Zelots* made themſelves Maſters of the Temple, and uſed its holy things as their own, as we are told in *lib.* vi. *cap.* 1. Then *John* with his *Edomites* entred into it, as we may learn from *cap.* 11. and as little abſtained from the holy things, being uſed to ſay in his own juſtification, ὡς δεῖ μὲν ἀδείας καλαχρήσασθαι τοῖς θείοις, ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς τῷ ναῷ στρατευομένους ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρέφεσθαι, *That thoſe who ſtood up for God, ought boldly to uſe the conſecrated things, and they who fought for the Temple be maintained out of it*, as *Joſephus* informs us in cap. 37. And thoſe that did ſuch things, might well enough be ſaid *to ſit in the Temple of God, as God, ſhewing themſelves as if they were God.*

Verſ. 5. Ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν.] The things here ſpoken of, ſeem to be taken from Chriſt's Diſcourſe in *Matth.* xxiv. where the like things are mentioned, as forerunners of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and ſo of his final Coming. Whence it might be eaſily inferred, that the laſt Judgment was not as yet at hand, becauſe thoſe things, which were as the Harbingers of the exciſion of *Jeruſalem*, had not as yet happen'd.

Verſ. 6. *Note* h. The τὸ κατέχον is that which reſtrained the *Jews* from breaking out into open Rebellion; *viz.* partly the Reverence of the chief men of the *Jewiſh* Nation, who were againſt making War with the *Romans*, becauſe they ſaw there was no hope of ſhaking off their Yoke, and that the thing could not be attempted without the Ruin of the *Jews*; partly the fear of the *Roman* Armies, which the *Jews* had not yet laid aſide, eſpecially while they hoped they might live a quiet life under their Governours. As long as theſe things continued in the minds of the *Jews*, the Counſels of the Seditious reſted ſecret, and the number of thoſe that were deſirous of Innovations was but ſmall: but aſſoon as the chief Men of the Nation began to be deſpiſed by the Conſpirators, and ſome hope of Victory appear'd, becauſe the greateſt part of the People were incenſed againſt the *Romans*, and the Preſident was remiſs and cowardly; then the *Jewiſh* Nation,

Nation, like a swift Torrent, that should have broken down its banks, rushed headlong into its own Destruction; then all the vilest sort of men began openly to put in practice their impious Designs. This *Josephus* relates at large in several places of his History of the *Jewish War*, and particularly in *lib.* 2. And S. *Paul* wrote this in the 13*th* year of *Claudius*, when *Felix* had been again sent Procurator into *Judea*; at which time tho the *Jews* were weary of their Yoke, and had raised the last year a Tumult, yet they still obeyed, as to the main body of the Nation. Chapter II.

What the chief Men among the *Jews* thought of engaging in a War with the *Romans*, *Josephus* in many places shews; see but *Agrippa*'s Oration in *lib.* 2. *cap.* 28. in which he dissuades the *Jews* from rebelling, and endeavours *to keep in* κατέχειν the seditious. And till that time he and the rest of the principal Men of the *Jewish* Nation had some Authority over the common People; but *Gessius Florus* had so highly injured and provoked them, that they utterly refused to obey him; and when *Agrippa* would have perswaded them to submit patiently to his Government, till there was another sent in his room, ὀργισθέντες ἐβλασφήμουν εἰς τὸ βασιλέα, καὶ τῆς πόλεως αὐτὸν ἐξωθοῦντο· τόλμων δέ τινες καὶ σφενδόνας καὶ λίθους ἐπ' αὐτὸν βάλλειν· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὴν ὀργὴν τῶν νεωτερίζόντων ΑΚΑΤΑΣΧΕΤΟΝ ἰδὼν —— ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν: *in a great rage they reviled the King, and commanded him to go out of the City; yea some of the Seditious were so bold as to fling stones at him. And the King seeing the fury of the Innovators to be* UNRESTRAINABLE —— *departed into his Kingdom.* They are the words of *Josephus* in *cap.* 29. Afterwards he relates the beginning of the Rebellion; to which the Priests and all the leading Men in vain opposed themselves, being no longer able to hold in the enraged multitude, as they had done in former times. Yea many of them were killed, as *Ananias*, *Ananus*, *Jesus* and others; whose Authority being once despised, those wicked Captains of the Seditious discover'd their minds, and shewed that it was a tyrannical Power, and not the Liberty of the People that they had aimed at. At the same time they set upon the *Romans*, and took courage from the cowardise of *Gessius*, as *Josephus* declares at large in *lib.* ii. *c.* 31. *& seqq.*

So that the Authority of the chief of the Jewish Nation, and the fear of the *Romans* were the τὸ κατέχον, τὸ κωλύμενον, or *the thing that withheld* the Jews. Which obstacle being removed, the Seditious thought the time was now at length come, in which they might ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, openly declare their purposes, and act as the Leaders of the People of the *Jews*. That *Simon* the Son of *Giora*, who affected to become a Tyrant, and robb'd and plunder'd the *Acrabatena Toparchia*, was repressed by

Chapter II. *Ananus*, Πεμφθέντος ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὑπ' Ἀνάνου καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων στρατιᾶς, *by an Army sent against him by Ananus and the Rulers*; but he fled to the Robbers which were at *Maſſada*, and ſtayed till *Ananus* and the reſt of his Enemies were killed, as we are told by *Joſephus* in the laſt *chap.* of the 2d *Book*. See lib. iv. and v. where the Villanies of theſe wicked men are at large related. This is much more probable, than what Dr. *Hammond* has invented about the diſſembling of *Simon* and the *Gnoſticks*, whilſt the Jews and Chriſtians did in ſome meaſure agree with one another; for which he alledges no Argument out of Hiſtory.

Verſ. 7. *Note* i. The μυστήριον ἀνομίας which began to work at this time, conſiſted in this, that under the pretence of ſetting the people of the Jews at liberty, yea and of a more ſtrict obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*, a moſt treacherous and *wicked* Deſign of domineering was concealed, till the ſtrength of the Conſpirators being increaſed, it appeared at laſt what they aimed at. So the *Zelots* behaved themſelves, who, as an unlawful thing, rejected the Sacrifices which uſed to be offered up for the Romans; tho the Prieſts ſhewed that it was not a crime to receive Sacrifices from the Gentiles. See *Joſephus de Bello Judaico*, *lib.* ii. *c.* 30. who affirms that this was the beginning of the Jewiſh War. In the mean while the Zelots did not think it unlawful for them to commit any villany whatſoever after they had laid aſide the fear of puniſhment. The ſame *Hiſtorian* ſpeaks of them thus in *lib.* vi. *cap.* 1. Ἐλεάζαρος ὁ τοῦ Σίμωνος ὃς δὴ καὶ τὰ πρῶτα τοῦ δήμου τοὺς ζηλωτὰς ἀπέκρινεν εἰς τὸ τέμενος, ὡς ἀγανακτῶν ἤδειν ὅτι τοῖς ὁσημέραι τοῦ Ἰωάννου πολεμίοις, ὃ μηδὲ ἀνεπαύετο φόνων ὤν. τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς αὐτῷ μεταβασιάζειν τυράννων μὴ φέρων ὑποδεέστερος, πρὸς τοῦ ὅλου, καὶ δουλείας ὑπόθυμος, δίκαιος: Eleazar *the Son of* Simon, *who had firſt ſeparated the* Zelots *from the People, and carried them into the Temple, as offended with the continual bold attempts of* John, *who did not ceaſe from ſhedding of blood, but in truth not enduring to be ſubject to younger Tyrants than himſelf, went off through a deſire of Superiority, and thirſt after Dominion.* And in *lib.* vii. *cap.* 30. after he had ſaid that the *Edomites* τῶν πολεμωτάτων ἀποκαλῶν δὲ πάντων ANOMIAN, *had introduced into all places the higheſt Iniquity:* he adds, ὡς ἂν τὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν κλεινὸν ὄνομα ἄκμαζεν, οἱ τῶν πραγμάτων τοῖς ἴσοις ἐπολέμουσιν. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κακίας ἔργον ἐξεμιμήσαντο, μηδ' ὅτι σφίσιν προῄρχθη μήπω ποθ' ἡδέως ἐκδιδύσκειν αὐτοὺς ἐζήλωσαν. καίτοι τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωθῆναι ὑπόθεσιν, ἢ καλεῖσθαι δικαίους τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι, διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ πεισθῆναι φόνων, ἢ τὰ μέγιστα τοῦ κακοῦ ἀγαθὰ νομίζοντες: *in which that ſort of men called* Zelots *had arrived to the higheſt pitch, who ſtained their Title with the foulneſs of their Actions. For they imitated every evil work; even that which had never been done before in the memory of man, they did not leave unimi-*

unimitated. Tho they impoſed on themſelves a ſpecious Name borrowed from the love of Virtue, either their ſavage Diſpoſition made them deride thoſe whom they injured, or they thought the greateſt Evils to be Virtues. This was a *Myſtery*, which was concealed under the name of a Virtue, *viz. Zeal*; but in reality it contained the vileſt *Iniquity*; which principally diſcover'd it ſelf when *Geſſius Florus* was Preſident of *Judea*, towards the end of *Nero*'s Reign. Chapter II.

But there was a *Myſtery*, as I ſaid, in this alſo, that theſe deſperate Villains made the Liberty of the People of the *Jews* a pretence for their Robberies, whilſt their deſign was to tyrannize over their Countrymen, as appeared afterwards by their Actions. Of this number were the *Sicarii* who oppoſed the Taxing of *Judea* by *Cyrenius*, and as *Joſephus* a little before ſays, συνίσταντο δὲ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι Ῥωμαίων διλωσίας καὶ πάντα τρόπον ὡς πολεμίοις ἐπανιστάμενοι, καὶ τοὺς μὲ κλῆσιν ἀφαιζόμενοι, καὶ φονεύοντες, ταῖς δ' εἰκῆ πᾶν ἐπιόντες. οὐδὲν γὰρ διαλλοφύλων αὐτοὺς ἔφασκον διαφέρειν, ὅσοι ἀφυνῶς τῷ θέματι τῶν Ἰουδαίοις ἐλευθερίας περιεμένουσι, καὶ δουλείαν αἰσχύνης ἕνεκα τὴν Ῥωμαίοις ἀναμολογησάμενοι. ὧν δὴ ἕνεκα τοῦτο ΠΡΟΦΑΣΙΣ εἰς ἀδικήλυμμα τῆς ἀμότητος, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίας ἐπ' αὐτῷ λεγόμενον σαφὲς δ' διὰ τὴν ἔργων ἐπεύσασαν: *conſpired againſt thoſe who were willing to obey the* Romans, *and exerciſed all manner of Hoſtilities againſt them, ſpoiling and carrying away their goods, and ſetting their houſes on fire: for they ſaid there was no difference between them and Strangers, who ſo baſely gave up the Liberty of their Country, for which they ought to fight, and profeſſedly choſe to be in bondage to the* Romans. *But this was a meer* PRETENCE, *and ſaid only to cover their Cruelty and Avarice, as their Actions plainly ſhewed.* Hence it appears, that before ever S. *Paul* wrote this Epiſtle, the *Myſtery of Iniquity* began *to work* among the *Jews*.

Ibid. Μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται.] It was not one man who *withheld* the *Jews* from breaking out into open Rebellion: but on one ſide they were reſtrained by the *Roman* Preſident; on the other by the chief men of the Nation, King *Agrippa*, and a great many Prieſts, as I have before ſhewed. But after theſe were expelled out of the City, or ſlain, the Seditious were at liberty to do what they pleaſed, and accordingly committed the moſt abominable Outrages, and acted contrary to all Laws both of Religion and Humanity. See *Joſephus de Bello Judaico* from *cap.* 28. *lib.* 2.

Verſ. 8. *Note* k.] I. Our Author truly obſerves, that the ὁ ἄνομος here are the ſame wicked perſons which were before called ὁ ἀνθρωπος, but thoſe, I think, are the Seditious *Jews*, not *Simon* and the *Gnoſticks*, notwithſtanding the mention made afterwards of *lying Wonders*, as I ſhall preſently ſhew.

II.

Chapter II. II. The deſtruction of *Simon*, which he relates out of *Arnobius*, is a meer Fable, which *Arnobius* had taken out of the *Clementine Homilies*, a Book full of Fables. This was the fault of Men and the Times, not of the Chriſtian Religion, which is grounded only upon Truth, to take up right or wrong every thing that offer'd it ſelf to their Minds, and make uſe of it againſt the *Heathens*, whom otherwiſe they might have overcome with very good reaſons, and really did ſo. Tho it is manifeſt that the foremention'd Book is ſuppoſititious, not St. *Clements*, and abounds with falſities; yet a great many have cited it as the genuin product of St. *Clement*, and confidently tranſcribed Fables out of it for certain Truths. Which I know not whether we ought to attribute to want of judgment, or unfaithfulneſs; yet one of them it muſt needs be. But now after the revival, not only of good Learning, but alſo the cultivating and reſtoring of right Reaſon, to give credit to ſuch Fables, is to prefer the darkneſs and deceits of former Ages to Light and Truth.

III. It is ſtrange that Dr. *Hammond* was not ſenſible of this, but no leſs ſtrange that he ſhould uſe the Authority of the Antients, ſo as to truſt them whenever they ſpeak in his favour, and lay a great ſtreſs upon their Teſtimonies when they ſeem to confirm his Conjectures, but not regard them at all when they ſpeak againſt him. For if they have any Authority at all diſtinct from probabilities of truth taken from things themſelves, it is as great in one thing as another; and if their Authority be none in it ſelf, let probabilities of Truth be alledged, and not vain Teſtimonies. Dr. *Hammond* produces a ſaying out of *Euſebius*, whom he would have believed, about the deſtruction of the *Gnoſticks*, becauſe if that be not thought true, a great many of his Interpretations muſt neceſſarily be rejected. But that *Euſebius* was miſtaken, I ſhall ſhew out of *Euſebius* himſelf, and the thing it ſelf at once. After he had mention'd the Hereſies of *Menander* the Diſciple of *Simon*, and the *Arch Heretick Cerinthus*, and the *Nicolaitans* in *Lib.* iii. *Cap.* 26, 27, 28, & 29. he concludes this laſt Chapter thus: Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Δοσιθέου χοίνης παρεφθαρκότων τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐγκεχωρηκότων, λόγῳ μὲν μικρὸν ἐς τὸ παντελὲς ἀπισθικότων εἰρήσθω *And ſo much for thoſe who having attempted to corrupt the truth, about the forementioned times, were in a moment deſtroyed.* But if we believe *Euſebius* himſelf, the followers of *Simon* were not utterly deſtroyed, even in the reign of *Conſtantin*, that is, when *Euſebius* himſelf lived, who in *Lib.* ii. *c.* 13. ſpeaking of *Simon*, ſays thus: ἐξ ὧν δὴ ΕΙΣ ΔΕΤΡΟ ὁι τῷ κατ' ἀυτὸν μετέντες ἀδιαφορίαν, τῷ σώζεσθαι δὴ καθεξόντα βίῳ φῶς πᾶν βιεσπμένην Χριστιανῶν φιλοσοφίαν ἀπεκρύπτοντο, ἢ μὲ ἔδοξαν ἀπολάτρευτα ἀεὶ τὰ εἴδωλα

εἰδώλα δαιμονίας ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον αὖθις ὀπλαμβάνοντας, καταπίπτοντες ὅτι γεγραπται καὶ εἰκόνας αὐτῶ τι τῶ Σιμῶνος, καὶ ἃ σὺν αὐτῶ διαφθείρονται Ελένῃ, θυμιάμασί τε καὶ θυσίαις καὶ σπονδαῖς τότε θρησκεύειν ἐπιχειροῦντες: *From whence* (according to *H. Valesius* his Interpretation) *till our Age, those that profess his Heresy, pretending to have embraced the Christian Religion, which is so famous for its Modesty and Sanctity, have yet relapsed again to the superstitious worship of* Dæmons, *which they seemed to have cast off, falling down before the Pictures and Images of* Simon *and the aforesaid* Helena, *and not scrupling to worship them with Incense, Sacrifices and Drink-offerings.* This shews that the Disciples of *Simon* did not perish with their Master, nor were destroyed *in a moment of time.* It is certain *Menander*, *Basilides*, and *Carpocrates*, who were either his Disciples or Imitators, did not die with him, but together with their Followers flourished in the second Age, as every one knows. Chapter II.

III. Which being so, it is strange that Dr. *Hammond* should contend for the extinction of the *Gnosticks* at that time, after which they chiefly flourished and were most known; *viz.* after the destruction of *Jerusalem.* Nay if any of *Simon*'s followers happen'd to perish with the *Jews* in *Jerusalem*, or *Judæa*, it is not probable that their obstinate adherence to the party of the *Jews*, was the occasion of it; because the *Gnosticks* (as our Author himself often tells us) made no scruple when it was for their safety to comply with the *Heathens* in their Worship, and it was easy to conjecture that the *Romans* would be Conquerors. So that neither History nor Probability is on our Author's side.

IV. I will not repeat that what he says about the Conflict which St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* had with *Simon* is a meer Fable, but shall observe that by *the Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord* is meant, not the Gospel, but the great Ease with which Christ should destroy the obstinate *Jews.* So *Psalm* x. 5. *he shall blow upon all his Enemies* (*in omnes hostes suos sufflabit*;) that is, he shall easily destroy them, as Interpreters will shew. So in *Plautus*, in *Milite Glorioso* Act. 1. Sc. 1. v. 17. a certain Flatterer, to intimate the great ease with which a Victory is obtained, expresses himself thus:

Cujus tu legiones difflavisti spiritu,
Quasi ventus folia, aut panniculum tectoriam.

So *Valerius Maximus* Lib. ix. cap. 1. Exemp. 5. *inter Externa*, speaking of the *Egyptians*, saith: *Quapropter deliciis tam enerves animi* SPIRITUM *exercitus nostri sustinere non potuerunt.* The same thing is otherwise

Chapter II. otherwiſe here expreſſed by τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τ παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, that is, by the mere brightneſs of his Coming; as we ſay of an Army which is eaſily defeated, that it could not ſo much as abide the glittering of the enemies Arms. And God is ſaid ἐπιφαίνεσθαι when he gives the Victory: See *Grotius* on this place, and Dr. *Hammond* on *Mat.* xxiv. It's certain the attempts of the *Magicians*, of which afterwards, were eaſily defeated, and the Jewiſh War finiſhed by *Veſpaſian* in little more than a Years time.

Verſ. 9. Οὐ ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ, &c.] Theſe words are thought by our Author to be ſo clear a deſcription of *Simon*, that he often repeats it as the chief ground of his Interpretation of this whole place. But there were alſo other Impoſtors, of whom this might be ſaid by St. *Paul*, which are frequently mention'd in *Joſephus*; to prevent all doubt of which, I ſhall alledg the words of that Hiſtorian; who in Lib. xx. c. 6. *Antiq. Judaic.* where he relates the tranſactions of *Felix*, ſaith thus: Λῃστείων ἡ χώρα πάλιν ἀνεπλήσθη καὶ γόητων ἀνθρώπων, οἱ τ ὄχλον ἠπάτων: *the Country was filled again with Robberies, and Magicians who deceived the Multitude.* And not long after: οἱ γόητες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἀνθρωποι τ ὄχλον ἔπεισθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἐρημίαν ἕπεσθαι, δεῖξειν γὰρ ἔφασαν ἐναργῆ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα, κατ' τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόνοιαν γινόμενα, καὶ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες τ ἀθεσμίνης τιμωρίας ὑπέσχον: *ſome Magicians and Deceivers perſwaded the People to follow them into the Deſert, ſaying that they would ſhew them mighty Signs and Wonders, which were wrought by the Providence of God; and many hearkning to their Perſwaſions, ſuffered for their Folly.* Afterwards he mentions the *Egyptian*, who is ſpoken of in the *Acts*. The like he ſays in Lib. ii. *de Bello Judaico* c. 23. To the ſame purpoſe is what he relates in *Lib.* vii. c. 30. about ſix thouſand Men that were burnt in the Porch of the Temple. Τύπτε αἴτιος τ ἀπωλείας Ψευδοπροφήτης κατέστη, κατ' ἐκείνην κηρύξας ἡμέραν τοῖς ὄχλοις τ πόλεως, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὀφείλει τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναδῆναι κελεύει δεξομένοις τὰ σημεῖα τ σωτηρίας: *The cauſe of theſe Mens deſtruction was a certain falſe Prophet, who had declared that day to thoſe who were in the City, that God commanded them to go up into the Temple, in order to receive ſigns of their ſafety.* And there was a multitude of ſuch falſe Prophets, as *Joſephus* tells us in the following words: Πολλοὶ ἦσαν ἐγκάθετοι τῶν τυράννων τότε πρὸς τ δῆμον προφῆται, προσμένειν τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ βοήθειαν καταγγέλλοντες, ὡς ἧττον αὐτομόλοιεν, καὶ τὸς ἐπίνοια νέως καὶ φυλακὴς γινομένης ἐλπὶς παρακρατοίη· σπίθεται ἢ ταχέως ἄνθρωπος ἐν συμφοραῖς· ὅταν ἢ δὴ τ κατεχόντων δεινῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν ὁ ἐξαπατῶν ὑπαγορεύῃ, τότ' ὁ πάσχων ὅλ῀ γίνεται τ ἐλπιδ῀. Τὸν γὰρ ἄθλιον δῆμον οἱ μὲ ἀπατεῶνες καὶ καταψευδόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ πανταχοῦ παρέπεισθον: *for there were many Prophets at that time ſuborned by the Tyrants, to admoniſh the People to wait for the aſſiſtance of God, that they might not go over to the Enemy, and*

and to confirm the hope of such as needed not to be watched, and were above fear. And a Man is soon perswaded to any thing in Adversity. But when he that deceives promises him also deliverance from the evils he is under, he that suffers becomes all Hope. And therefore those Impostors and beliers of God perswaded the miserable People. This excellently well agrees with the 10*th*, 11*th*, & 12*th* verses, where the condition of the unbelieving *Jews* is represented by St. *Paul*, almost in the same colours. Chapter III.

Ibid. Ἐν πάσῃ πλάνῃ, ἢ τίσιν ψεύδους.] It is highly probable that St. *Paul* has a reference to the words of *Christ* in *Mat.* xxiv. 24. whence it may be inferred that the Discourse here is about *Judæa* and the *Jews*, as it is there.

CHAP. III.

Vers. 2. Ἄτοπος when spoken of a Man, signifies *lewd*, *base*, *villanous*, and belongs no more to a *Gnostick* than any other wicked Man; such as there were a great many among the *Jews* and *Heathens*, who opposed the Gospel, which makes it unnecessary to recur to the Disciples of *Simon*, whom our Author supposes like so many Shadows to have followed or gone before the Apostles, without any certain ground from the History of that Age. What he says, that *Simon* is described by *Polycarp*, is also his own Conjecture, not the Affirmation of *Polycarp*, who speaks of any one possessed with those errors, and does not mention *Simon* by name. But this does not belong to this place. *Note a.* *Hesychius*; Ἄτοπα, πονηρὰ, ἀίχεα, *wicked*, *base things*. Ἀτοπία, ἀιχρότης, πονηρία, *baseness*, *wickedness*. The old *Glosses*: Ἀτόπημα, *flagitium*, *facinus*, *A villany*, *a wicked Action*. Ἀτοπματουργὸς, *facinorosus*, *villanous*. Ἄτοπος, *facinorosus*, *flagitiosus*.

Vers. 2. Οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις.] Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphrase interprets these words so, as if he thought that πίστις *Faith* here signified true Faith, in opposition to pretended. Which interpretation he seems to have invented for the sake of the *Gnosticks*, who feigned themselves to be Christians when they were not, and of whom he understood these words of St. *Paul*. But St. *Paul* says nothing here about the *Gnosticks*, but speaks of any bad Men, who through their wicked Dispositions did not only refuse to believe the Gospel themselves, but also hindred others from embracing it. Such were the *Jews*, who had a greater regard to the Ceremonies of the Law than to true Vertue, and every where opposed the progress of the Gospel with all their might, as appears from many places in the *Acts*, and the *Epistles* of the Apostles. Such were the *Epicureans* and other Pseudo-Philoso-

Chapter III.

phers, who lived in the practice of the greateſt Vices, which they cover'd with a philoſophical Cloak, and could not endure the ſanctity of the Chriſtian Doctrin; or being blinded by Pride, and a falſe conceit of their own Wiſdom, thought it would be a diſgrace to them to confeſs that Men ſo univerſally learned as they, could learn any thing from *Barbarians*, as the *Greeks* called them, or acknowledg that they had all the while before been ſtudying and philoſophizing in vain. Such were thoſe who heard St. *Paul* at *Athens*, as St. *Luke* tells us in *Acts* xvii. And ſeeing no one can doubt but that theſe Adverſaries of the Goſpel were diſperſed almoſt in all places throughout *Europe* and *Aſia*; what need is there of imagining to our ſelves, the *Gnoſticks* every where oppoſing the Apoſtles, of whoſe being ſo univerſally ſpread we have no account in any credible Author? And therefore ſetting aſide the *Gnoſticks*, let us ſay that the phraſe ὐ πάντων ἡ πίστις is uſed by the Apoſtle in this ſenſe: all Men indifferently are not qualified to embrace the Goſpel, but only thoſe who are lovers of Truth and Vertue, tho they are not ſufficiently acquainted with them before the Goſpel is preached to them. Such a diſpoſition as this is excellently deſcribed by Dr. *Hammond* on *John* vi. 37. and elſewhere.

Verſ. 5. Εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τῦ Θεῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τῦ Χριστῦ.] Here is an example of that ambiguity in the ſignification of a *Genitive* caſe, of which I have largely ſpoken in my *Ars Critica* Part 2. Sect. 1. Cap. 12. *Grotius* interprets the Love of God to ſignify that Love which is terminated upon God, and ſo makes the Genitive Θεῦ to have the relation of an object to ἀγάπη, which I acknowledg to be a ſenſe worthy of the Apoſtle. But if we interpret it of a *Love* commanded by God, ſo that the Genitive be underſtood to ſignify a Cauſe, the ſenſe will be altogether as proper and agreeable to the Goſpel. So again by ὑπομονὴν Χριστῦ *Grotius* thinks is meant *that patience of which Chriſt is the efficient*, and there is no doubt but that is frequently the ſignification of the Genitive caſe, as I have ſhewn in my *Ars Critica*. But yet ὑπομονὴν Χριστῦ may be interpreted of that *patience* of which *Chriſt* was a *Pattern*, and perhaps more fitly. And if by ὑπομονὴ we underſtand not ſo much *conſtancy* as *waiting for* the coming of Chriſt, then Chriſt will be the *object* of our ὑπομονὴ. And ſo this Phraſe is taken in *Revel.* i. 9. *I* John *your Brother, and companion in Tribulation, and in the Kingdom* καὶ ὑπομονῇ Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ, *and expectation of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Verſ. 6. Στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς.] That this Phraſe στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς *to withdraw your ſelves*, ſignifies to excommunicate, as our Author interprets it in his Paraphraſe, I do not believe; the propereſt word for that being

ἐκκόπτειν.

ἀκαίτιον. *Grotius* thinks, if there had been a Presbytery at *Theſſalonica*, St. *Paul* would have commanded theſe diſorderly Men to be excommunicated; but becauſe there was not, he only commands the reſt to avoid all familiar Converſation with them, which every particular Chriſtian had a power to do. But when he ſays there was no Presbytery at *Theſſalonica*, he is miſtaken, as I have ſhewn on 1 *Theſſ.* i. 1. That double Admonition which our Author in his Paraphraſe finds to be intimated in theſe words, and which ought to precede Excommunication, few doubtleſs would have perceived, without being advertiſed of it: Nor can I, for my part, perceive it yet. I grant the Apoſtle had twice admoniſhed the *Theſſalonians* about this matter, but does it preſently follow that thoſe Admonitions, which were twice read in the Church of *Theſſalonica*, were accounted as forerunners of Excommunication? Does it follow alſo that St. *Paul* had a reſpect to it in this place? I think not. Chapter III.

Ibid. Ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντας.] The Phraſe ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν is not barely *to be idle*, but to do that which Idleneſs, eſpecially in young people, is the cauſe of, that is, to live wantonly and irregularly. The *Old Gloſſes*: Ἄτακτος, *inquietus, inordinatus, petulans, troubleſom, diſorderly, wanton.* Ἀτακτήριεν, *tumultuoſiores.* Ἀτάκτως, *inordinatè.* Ἀταξία, *enormitas, tumultuatio.*

Verſ. 12. Ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσι.] That is, the Bread which they ſhall get by their Labour, for that is every ones *own* which he acquires by lawful Induſtry. This perhaps may lead us into the true meaning of that in the Lord's Prayer, τὸν ἄρτον ΗΜΩΝ τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν, *give us* OUR *Bread*; that is, order it ſo by thy Providence, that we may not live by other Mens Labours, but upon Food got by our own Labour. And ſo the ſenſe of the whole Petition will be this, Grant that the remaining part of our Lives we may daily by our Labour provide Food for our ſelves. On the contrary, they are ſaid in Latin *alieno pane veſci*, not whom another Man maintains, becauſe they are induſtrious in his Service, but who like Drones, live idly at another Man's coſt. So *Juvenal* begins his *vth* Sat. againſt Paraſites thus:

Si te propoſiti nondum pudet, atque eadem eſt mens
Ut bona ſumma putes, aliena vivere quadra,
Si potes illa pati, &c.

Verſ. 14. Εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε.] The Antients for the moſt part omitting the uſe of Points, it is uncertain whether theſe words ſhould be rendred, *if any Man does*

Chapter III. *not obey our Word, signify that Man by an Epistle*, i. e. write me word who it is; or, *if any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that Man.* The former is preferred by *Erasmus* and *Grotius*, and indeed σημειῶσθαι διὰ ἐπιστολῆς is oftner said than λόγῳ διὰ ἐπιστολῆς. The latter by *Beza* and Dr. *Hammond*. Besides, these who are fond of Excommunication, make σημειῶσθαι to be all one with *to brand* by Excommunication, but they ought to have produced an example of that signification. For all *Lexicons* indeed tell us, that σημειῶσθαι is to *signify* or *notify*; but I don't know whether it be ever used for to *brand* or *set a mark of infamy* upon a Man, *ignominia notare*. I confess that is often the notion of the Latin Verb *notare*, but hence it does not follow that the Greek Verb σημειῶσθαι signifies the same.

Vers. 16. Ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ.] It seems the *Vulgar Interpreter* read τόπῳ, having rendred it *loco*. And that reading is approved by *Grotius*, who explains the mind of the Apostle thus: *Deus det vobis res bonas sive Thessalonicæ eritis, sive in Judæam, seu Syriam redibitis, sive aliò migrabitis: God give you good things, whether ye stay at* Thessalonica, *or whether you return into* Judæa *or* Syria, *or wherever else you go.* This is sense good enough, but most Copies have ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ, which I chuse to follow, in this sense: *God give you always* (διὰ παντὸς, viz. χρόνου) *Peace by all means*; [so it is in the English Translation] that is, whether Peace be taken for all Prosperity; or for Tranquillity, which the Heathens may let you enjoy; or for Concord, which ye may preserve among your selves, both publickly and privately. For all these things are in Scripture comprehended under the name of *Peace*. This is certainly the fittest sense of these words, if the whole Assembly be considered, which lived at *Thessalonica*, and to which St. *Paul* writes; not to particular Persons, who might take those Journeys which *Grotius* speaks of.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to *Timothy*.

AT the end of the *Præmon.*] What Dr. *Hammond* here attempts in order to assign the time in which this Epistle was written, is contrary to what he says about the Journeys of *Timothy*; for it is not likely that *Timothy* was left Bishop at *Ephesus*, that presently after he should leave that City, and travel with St. *Paul*, and go to visit him as far as *Rome*. It is much more probable that *Timothy* was ordained Bishop of *Ephesus* after St. *Paul* was released from his Bonds, and went from *Rome* to *Asia*, about the year of *Christ* lxiv. or the xith of *Nero*, and that the year after this Epistle was written, as Dr. *Pearson* in his *Annales Paulinæ* thinks.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 3, & 4. Καθὼς παρεκάλεσα, &c.] These two Verses must be joined with the 18th, all the rest which intervene being a *Parenthesis*. It is, I confess, a harsh *Hyperbaton*, but St. *Paul* was not curious about such things.

Vers. 4. *Note* a. What Dr. *Hammond* says here about *Antiphanes*, as the Author of the *Gnostick* or *Valentinian* Genealogies, he ows to *Irenæus* in Lib. 4. c. 19. who affirms that that Poet wrote such things in his *Theogonia*. It is strange that Comedy of *Antiphanes* should no where else be cited. But perhaps this was not the name of a Comedy, but *Irenæus* refers to a place in which something was said upon that Subject, [viz. *the generation of the Gods*] as in *Aristophanes* his *Aves* we have something still extant about that matter. As to *Hesiod* the thing is plain, if we read the beginning of his *Theogonia*; and the *Valentinians*

Chapter I. *lentinians* are more than once upbraided with applying the fabulous Stories of that Poet to their purpoſe, by *Irenæus* and *Epiphanius*. But as to *Philiſtio* who wrote Mimick Poems, I very much doubt whether he be rightly reckon'd in the number of thoſe who deſcribed the Genealogies of the Gods. I am apt to think our Author was deceived as to him, by miſunderſtanding a Paſſage in *Epiphanius*, in *Hæreſ.* xxxiii. which is that of the *Ptolemaites*, S. 1. where *Epiphanius* ſpeaks thus: Ὅτι γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν τραγῳδοποιῶν τις, ἢ τε ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς μιμολὸς ὁ τρέπων, οἱ περὶ Φιλιστίωνα λέγω, καὶ Διογένη, ἢ τὰ ἄπιστα γεγράφατε, ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, οἱ τοὺς μύθους ἀναγεγραφότες καὶ ἐπλάσαντες, τοσοῦτον ψεῦδος ἐπινοῆσαι ἐκπεπώκασι, ὡς ὅτοι τολμηρῶς φερόμενοι μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς δεινὰ ἑαυτοῖς κατεσκεύασαν, καὶ τὰ νῦν τῶν πεισθέντων αὐτοῖς ἀνθρώπων εἰς μυθικὰς ζητήσεις σπείσαλον καὶ γενεαλογίας ἀπειρήκασι: *For none of thoſe antient Tragedians, or their Succeſſors the Mimicks*, Philiſtio, *I ſpeak of, and* Diogenes, *who wrote things exceeding all belief, nor any of all thoſe other Writers and patchers up of Fables, could have forged ſo great a Ly as theſe men* [temerè ſuæ ipſorum vitæ periculo acti finxerunt] *acted by the fear of their own lives, have boldly invented, and intangled the minds of men who believe them, in fooliſh Queſtions and endleſs Genealogies.* *Epiphanius* here compares the τὸ ἄπιστον *falſeneſs* or *incredibility* of the Fables, which were written by the Mimick Poets, with the τὸ ἄπιστον of the fooleries of the *Valentinians*, but he does not ſay theſe latter owed their Genealogies to the *Mimicks*.

Verſ. 15. *Note* c. I do not believe St. *Paul* here has a reſpect to the *Jews Cabbala*, for ἀποδέχεσθαι in Greek very often ſignifies *to approve*, and ἀποδοχὴ *approbation*. So that ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος is a pure Greek Phraſe, in which there is no alluſion to the *Cabbala*. *Suidas*: ἀποδέχομαι, αἰτιατικῇ καὶ γενικῇ. ὁμολογῶ. ἀποδέχομαί σε τῶν τρόπων, καὶ ἀποδέχομαί σε τοὺς τρόπους: *The word is joined with an Accuſative and Genitive Caſe, and ſignifies to approve, as* ἀποδέχομαι, &c. *I approve your manners.* So *Heſychius*: Ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀποδοχῆς ἀξωθέντα: eſteemed *worthy of acceptation.* So the old Gloſſes: Ἀποδέχεται, *probo, acceptum habeo, comprobo, I approve, I account acceptable.* Ἀποδέχεται, *comprobat.* And hence comes ἀπόδεκτος, which *Heſychius* interprets by ἐπαινετὸς *laudable*. See alſo my Note on 1 *Cor.* ii. 14.

Verſ. 17. *Note* d. 1. Βασιλεὺς αἰώνων is an imitation of a Hebrew form of ſpeech very common among the *Rabbins*, who often call God מלך עולם *melech holamim*, or מלך עולם *melech holam*, that is, *the King of the World*, as appears by their forms of Prayer. It is not probable that St. *Paul* would uſe a fooliſh term of the *Gnoſticks*, where he does not diſpute againſt them.

II. I am apt to think that the *Gnoſticks* called Angels, or inferiour Deities, αἰῶνες, not from *Ezechiel*, where they are ſtiled *living Creatures*,

tures, which has no affinity with αἰωνες *ages*, but as it were αἰει ὀντες *everlasting*, as *Homer* often calls the Gods: And ſo wreſted an uſual word to a ſignification which did not belong to it. In the mean while, what is here ſaid by St. *Paul* may as well be oppoſed to the *Heathens* as the *Gnoſticks*; to whom our Author had no reaſon to ſuppoſe the Apoſtle alluded almoſt in every word. Chapter I.

Verſ. 18. *Note* f. Our Author here confounds things very different with one another, becauſe there is ſome ſimilitude between them in ſound: which is a fault he often commits, not being ſufficiently accuſtomed to a grammatical ἀκρίβεια, nor having taken ſo much pains in ſtudying Criticks, as Divinity and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. I. In *Num.* iv. 3. the word לצבא muſt not be rendred *into the hoſt*, but *into the troop*, or *company*, as I have ſhewn on that place. And a *troop* or *company* is ſo called, becauſe any company of men marching in order, is in ſome reſpect like an Army, whether put in array or moving forwards. See my Notes on *Exod.* vi. 26. and xii. 41.

II. In *Numb.* i. 50. This Law is given to the *Levites*: *They ſhall bear the Tabernacle, and all the veſſels thereof; they ſhall miniſter unto it, and ſhall encamp round about the Tabernacle*: which words muſt be underſtood in their proper ſenſe; for the *Levites* in the Deſart did really encamp about the Tabernacle. And therefore they make nothing to the metaphorical ſignification of an *Army*, tho they gave occaſion to it.

III. Our learned Author had not look'd into the place in *Exodus* xxxviii. 8. for there is no mention there made of Women lately delivered. *Moſes* is ſaid to have made *the Laver of braſs, and its foot of braſs, of the Looking-glaſſes of women aſſembling by troops at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.* There is no ſignification here of *warring*, or of ſacred Miniſtration. See my Notes on that place.

IV. In 2 *Sam.* vi. 2. God is called *the Lord of Hoſts*, in the ſame ſenſe, as frequently elſewhere, not as the Lord of the Ark or Tabernacle, which is a Phraſe that no where occurs, and the Ark and Tabernacle are never called *hoſts*; but the Diſcourſe is about conveying the Ark from one place to another, to which the title of *Lord of hoſts*, that is, Preſident of War, has no manner of relation. But what then? Is not God often called by that name in the Prophets, where neither War, nor the Miniſtry of the Prieſts or Levites is ſpoken of? Yes, it is a title the Prophets frequently make uſe of, whatever be the ſubject of the Diſcourſe; juſt as *Homer* in abundance of places calls *Jupiter* νεφεληγερετης, where he has nothing at all about Clouds or Rain; and *Achilles* ποδας ωκυς, where there is nothing ſaid about running. Such as

 theſe.

Chapter I. these are perpetual Epithets, and as it were Appendages to proper Names, or like Sirnames, which are uſed whenever thoſe Names are mention'd without any certain deſign. The *Jews* called the true God *the Lord of Hoſts*, becauſe they look'd upon Victory as one of the chief Favours God could confer upon men in this World; and on the contrary, a Defeat in War, whereby whole Nations were ſometimes ſubjected to Slavery, as the greateſt evil. They ſaw alſo often, that thoſe whom God favoured obtained the Victory, tho they were inferiour both in Policy and Strength to their Enemies: and that tho all military Stratagems were uſed in Battels, yet the Event was uncertain, and did not depend upon men; becauſe unforeſeen Accidents, tho very ſmall, are ſometimes the cauſe of Victories and Defeats. Therefore they thought that God did preſide in a ſpecial manner over War, and thence made him a Sirname. The Heathens ſometimes ſpeak almoſt in the ſame manner about their Deities, as *Hirtius* de *Bello Alexandr.* c. 75. where he deſcribes the Battel between *Cæſar* and *Pharnaces*, whom *Cæſar* overcame with much fewer Forces, and thoſe not ſufficiently prepared to fight: *Clamore ſublato, ſaith he, confligitur, multum adjuvante natura loci, plurimum* DEORUM *immortalium* BENIGNITATE; *qui cum* OMNIBUS CASIBUS BELLI INTERSUNT, *tum præcipue eis, quibus nihil potuit ratione adminiſtrari: After a great ſhout* (on both ſides) *the two Armies engaged one another, the ſituation of the place being a great advantage* (to *Cæſar*'s Party) *but the* FAVOUR *of the* GODS *a much greater; who as they are* PRESENT *in* ALL *the* CHANCES *of* WAR, *ſo eſpecially in thoſe in which there is no room for the exerciſe of Conduct.* For theſe Reaſons, the *Jews* attributed to God the title of *Lord of hoſts*, which muſt by no means be urged, as if it were never uſed but where there is a reſpect had to an Army, either properly ſo called, or metaphorically.

V. The Angels are called *Gods Hoſts* in *Pſalm* ciii. 21. becauſe God uſes them as Kings and Generals do Armies, to aſſiſt their Friends in danger, and ſubdue their Enemies; and the Stars, not the Sun and Moon only, becauſe they are like a ſtraggling Army, diſperſed over all parts of the Heaven.

VI. Our learned Author had not caſt his eyes upon *Iſa.* xl. 2. where there is no mention of the *Prieſthood*, no footſtep of the *Levites*. The Prophet ſpeaks thus: *Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, ſaith your God. Speak that which may pleaſe Jeruſalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accompliſhed, becauſe her ſin is expiated.* That which the Prophet here calls *Jeruſalems warfare* is the baniſhment of the *Jews*, and the miſeries enſuing thereupon, which he foretels would ſhortly be at an end.

I

I cannot conceive by what Engines this can be applied to the Ceſſation of the Levitical Prieſthood. Chapter II.

VII. In 2 *Tim.* ii. 4. there is mention indeed made of *fighting*, but in a proper ſenſe. But the place alledged by Dr. *Hammond* is in the ſame Epiſtle, *chap.* iv. 7. and the Apoſtle does not there ſpeak about Warring, or make uſe of a Metaphor taken from War, but from the *Agones*. *I have ſtrived*, ſaith he, *a good ſtrife*, τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἠγώνισμαι, *I have finiſhed my race*, δέδωκα, *I have kept the faith*. So that I wonder our Author ſhould alledg that place.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. THE word μύσται in the paſſage of St. *Chryſoſtom*, alledged in the beginning of this Note, is not well rendred *Prieſts*; for μύσται ſignifies any Believers, that were preſent at the Celebration of the Euchariſt, or any other religious Myſteries. And the reaſon why St. *Chryſoſtom* ſays the thing was known to *them*, and not to others, is becauſe the Chriſtians prayed for the Emperors μετὰ τὴν θείαν ἀναφοράν, when there were none but *Myſtæ* preſent. In the *Apoſtolical Conſtitut.* lib. 8. c. 13. in a Prayer *for the faithful*, μετὰ τὴν θείαν ἀναφοράν, *after a divine Oblation*, we meet with theſe words; Τῶν βασιλέων καὶ πάντων ἐν ὑπεροχῇ διαιτωμένων, ἵνα εἰρηνεύοντες τὸν βίον διάγωμεν, &c. *Let us pray for Kings, and thoſe that are in Authority, that we may live at peace*, &c.

II. In St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Liturgy, Dr. *Hammond* renders the words θεοφυλάκτους βασιλέας by *Defenders of God*, or *of the Faith of Chriſt*, becauſe, I ſuppoſe, he had in his mind the Title of the King of *Great Britain*, who is ordinarily called *Defender of the Faith*. But θεοφύλακτος ſignifies *one that is kept* or *preſerved by God*, not one that preſerves or defends God; as θεοδίδακτος is *one taught of God*, and not one that teaches God. So in the old Latin Verſion of the Liturgy of St. *Baſil*, Ed. Plant. *An.* 1560. *Pro piiſſimo & à* Deo conſervando *Imperatore noſtro, omnique palatio & exercitu ejus, Dominum poſtulemus. Let us beſeech God for our moſt pious Emperor*, to be preſerved by God, *and for all the Court, and his Army*. So in the Tranſlation of the Maſs of S. *Chryſoſtom*, publiſh'd by *Leo* the *Tuſcan*: *Pro piiſſimis & cælitus cuſtoditis Imperatoribus noſtris, toto palatio & exercitu eorum, Dominum deprecemur. Let us pray earneſtly to the Lord for our moſt religious Emperors, which Heaven preſerves, for the whole Court, and their Armies*. The thing is clear, and needed no proof, if our learned Author had not ſtumbled in it.

Chapter III. Verſ. 8. *Note* b. The Doctor read *Ariſteas* too haſtily; for if he had read the following words, he would have ſeen that there was no need of any Correction, there being immediately added after the words alledged, ὑγιάσαντο ἀφ' ὅλου ἀνάγνων, καὶ ὅλων ἐκέτευσαν θεοπίσματα, and ſo the entire ſenſe being, *as it is the general cuſtom of the* Jews, *having waſhed their hands in ſalt water, after they had prayed to God, they went to reading, and every one interpreted.*

Verſ. 15. *Note* d. I wonder our Author has made no mention of the Opinion of *Grotius*, who following *Beza*, interprets διὰ τεκνογονίας by ἐν τεκνογονίᾳ; and ſo the Apoſtle's meaning will be, either that Women, tho they are puniſhed for Sin in Child-bearing, ſhould nevertheleſs be ſaved if, &c. as *Beza* thinks; or, that their bearing of Children ſhould be no hindrance to their Salvation if, &c. which *Grotius* prefers. Theſe are certainly the moſt natural Interpretations, and from them we may eaſily aſſign a Reaſon of the confuſion of the Numbers, which are often ſet promiſcuouſly, when the Diſcourſe is about a *whole Species*, as *Grotius*, and Dr. *Hammond* himſelf, well obſerves.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. NO Man that underſtands what is the Office of a Biſhop or Presbyter, which may be learned from theſe Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, can doubt but that it is *a very honourable and excellent work* κάλλιστον ἔργον. But we ought not therefore to decry other conditions of Life, as worldly; in which a man may as truly ſerve God, provided he regulates himſelf according to the preſcriptions of the Goſpel: nor can I aſſent to what our Author here ſays about *Demas*, of which I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak afterwards.

As to the deſertion of that Office, it is a great Sin without doubt in thoſe, who have applyed themſelves to it being duly qualified, and can diſcharge it as they ought and uſefully; but how many are there who raſhly aſpire to that Office, as to ſome Magiſtracy or ſecular Dignity, for the ſake of Honour and Profit, who are deſtitute of Gifts neceſſary to the right exerciſe of it? And it would be much better if ſuch men repented of their Vow (if a purpoſe reſpecting only Riches and Honours ought to be called a Vow) after they had found by experience how unfit they were for the Miniſtry of the Goſpel, and ſet themſelves to ſome other employment, for which they were better qualified. Such Men οὐκ ὑπεδύσαντο καλὸν ἔργον, ἀλλὰ πηδᾷ καὶ πλέκει, who whatever Orders they have entered into, or whatever Promiſes they have made, it would

would be well if they were looſed from their Engagements, and *returned to the World* as they uſe to ſay, than that they ſhould profane and abuſe ſo ſacred an Employment. But if that were done, ſo many Legions of *Angels of the Lord* would be reduced to a few. Chapter III.

Verſ. 2. *Note* b. I. There is a fault either of the Printer, or Dr. *Hammond* in his haſte, in the citation of the *Neocæſarean Synod*, for that which he refers to is in *Canon* 7. and there are but 15 Canons of that Synod.

II. There is ſuch another miſtake in the citation of the *Ancyran Synod*, for Dr. *Hammond* referred to *Can.* 19. and there are no more than 25 in all. Beſides, the word ὅρος does not ſignify in that Canon a term of time, but a Conſtitution or Determination, by which a certain penalty was impoſed upon ſuch as had been twice married. Ὅρον γὰρ τύπον ἢ κανόνα λέγει, *by* ὅρος *is meant a Conſtitution and Canon*, ſaith *Zonaras*.

III. Our Author cites *Plutarch in his* Ῥωμαϊκ. as if he had looked into the Greek; whereas *Plutarch* ſays the quite contrary, as will appear by his words, which I ſhall ſet down entire, that the Reader may ſee Citations are not always to be truſted; becauſe our learned Author relying upon the fidelity of others, obtrudes upon us I know not what Dreams for the ſenſe of *Plutarch*. Theſe are that Writer's words in *Quæſt.* c. 3. Διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις ἑορταῖς οὐκ ἔστι γαμεῖσθαι παρθένοις, αἱ δὲ χήραις γαμοῦνται; *Why is it not the cuſtom for Virgins to be married on the publick Feaſts, and for Widows to be married?* Dr. *Hammond* ſuppoſes the contrary; tho he is not conſiſtent with himſelf in what follows. Now to that Queſtion *Plutarch* anſwers thus: Πότερον, ὡς ὁ Βάρρων εἴρηκεν, ὅτι λυπούμεναι μὲν αἱ παρθένοι γαμοῦνται, χαίρουσαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες· ἑορτὴ δὲ μηδὲν λυπούμενα ποιεῖν, μηδὲ πρὸς ἀνάγκην; ἢ μᾶλλον ὅτι ταῖς μὲν παρθένοις καλὸν μὲν ὀλίγων, ταῖς δὲ χήραις αἰσχρὸν πολλῶν παρόντων γαμεῖσθαι, ζηλωτὸς δὲ ὁ πρῶτος γάμος, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἀποδοκιμασία. *Is it, as* Varro *ſaid, becauſe Virgins when they are married are ſorrowful, but women joyful? And at a feaſt time nothing ſhould be done ſorrowfully or by conſtraint. Or rather becauſe it is decent for Virgins to be married in the preſence of a great many, but not for Widows. For the firſt marriage is deſirable, but the ſecond is abominable.* The laſt words are alledged by *Grotius*, than which nothing can be more pertinent to the buſineſs in hand; and our Author would not have done amiſs, if he had followed him, who is for the moſt part a faithful guide. *Plutarch* adds ſome things to which our Author refers, which I ſhall therefore tranſcribe: Αἰσχύνονται γὰρ ἂν ζώντων τῶν πρώτων ἑστίας λαμβάνουσαι, ἀποθανόντων δὲ ἂν ἀποθανόντων, ὅταν ἡσυχῇ χήρεύσωσι μᾶλλον, ὃ πρέπει καὶ σεμνόν ἐστι: *for they are aſhamed, if while their former Husbands are alive, they are married to others; and if they die, they mourn, which makes them pre-*

Chapter III. *fer Quiet, to the noiſe of a Multitude, and pompous Solemnities.* Note, that the Law had impoſed this upon Widows, or ſuch as were forſaken by their Husbands, that they might not be too haſty to marry a ſecond time.

IV. To the places alledged by *Grotius* and our Author, as well here as on *Chap.* v. 9. add this out of *Livy*, [Lib. x. c. 23. Mr. *Le Clerc* does not cite the place, which I wonder at, becauſe he blames Dr. *Hammond* ſo often for the ſame thing] by which it will appear, who it is that is ſaid to be *the Husband of one Wife.* That Hiſtorian deſcribing the ſtrife between the Roman Matrons, in the Nobles Temple of Chaſtity, out of which *Virginia* was expelled, becauſe ſhe being a Noble Woman, had married a Commoner, ſaith: *Brevis altercatio inde, ex iracundia muliebri in contentionem animorum exarſit, cum ſe Virginia patriciam & pudicam in patriciæ Pudicitiæ templum ingreſſam & UNI NUPTAM, ad quem virgo deducta ſit ——— vero gloriaretur. A ſhort quarrel occaſion'd by that means, through the Womens peeviſhneſs, grew to a very fierce contention,* Virginia *boaſting that ſhe being a noble and vertuous Woman, had enter'd into the Nobles Temple of Chaſtity, and had been* MARRIED *to* ONE *Man, to whom ſhe had been deliver'd a Virgin.*

Verſ. 15. in *Note* e. *Col.* 2. *Lin.* 8. after the words, *Donour, or Plenipotentiary.*] Dr. *Hammond* would have done well if he had proved what he aſſerts here about a Metropolitan Power, and the reſt of what he ſays, out of Scripture, or thoſe Antients which lived neareſt the times of the Apoſtles; becauſe he could not but know that there were ſome in the World who would look upon the greateſt part of thoſe things as Fables. But perhaps they were delivered firſt from the Pulpit, in a Diſcourſe to the People, and afterwards inſerted in his Annotations on the New Teſtament, but in an improper place. What he ſays about the Church and the Houſe of God, there is no one undoubtedly but knows, and it might have been ſaid much more clearly in three words, without the tedioufneſs of ſo many repetitions.

Ibid. *Lin.* 39. after the words, *one and the ſame Title.*] Our learned Author might have alledged another place out of *Maimonides*, more like this of St. *Paul*, which has been already alledged by Mr. *Lightfoot* in his *Deſcription* of the *Temple* of *Jeſus*, Chap. xxii. *This great Council ſetting in Garith* הם עקר תורה שבעל פה ועמודי הוראה *was the* FOUNDATION *of the Oral Law, and the* PILLAR *of Inſtruction.* For this is ſaid of an Aſſembly, as it is alſo an *Aſſembly* which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of.

Ibid.

Ibid. At the end of the ſame *Note.*] I. All this will be inſignificant, if the words *Pillar and ground of Truth* ſhould not belong to the Church, but to that which follows, viz. *the myſtery of Godlineſs*. Which is the opinion of *Epiſcopius* and *Camero*, none of the loweſt rank of Divines, who may be conſulted. Chapter III.

II. I wonder our Author ſhould produce theſe words as out of the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians: for they that did ſo*, &c. when there are no ſuch words in that Epiſtle. Whether they are to be found in any other place of *Ignatius*, I cannot tell, nor have I time to look; but it was not prudently done to cite them as out of a place where they are not.

III. Nor is that confuſed heap of places out of *Ignatius* much to the purpoſe, becauſe St. *Paul* ſays nothing here about Biſhops, and becauſe ſuch times may happen wherein it would be a piece of madneſs to truſt Biſhops, as our Author acknowledges. So that whatever is ſaid by *Ignatius*, muſt all be underſtood with this exception; provided a Biſhop truly diſcharge the Office of a Paſtor, not if he be a Heretick, or a Tyrant, who thinks he is not for the Flock, but the Flock for him; not if he obſtinately perſiſt in groſs Errors, which he will not by any reaſon be brought to renounce, through his Pride or Covetouſneſs. It was poſſible that in the time of *Ignatius*, all the Biſhops, of whom many had ſeen the Apoſtles, and many had their Diſciples for their Teachers, might be Men devoted to the Truth, and faithful Paſtors; and that induced him to inſiſt ſo much upon their Authority: but theſe are not leſſons for all times and places.

Verſ. 16. It muſt be owned that our Author in the precedent Annotations, has often acted the part of a Preacher or Divine, rather than an Interpreter. And therefore to ſupply what is wanting in him, I ſhall ſubjoin here out of another Engliſh Gentleman, a Diſcourſe much more *critical* than any thing ſaid by Dr. *Hammond*. I mean Dr. *Pearſon*, who has treated of the true reading of this place, on the 2*d Article* of the *Apoſtles Creed*, p. 128. where after he had ſaid that all the Greek Copies have Θεὸς, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, &c. not ὃ *which was manifeſted*, &c. he ſpeaks thus: "Nor need we be troubled "with the obſervation of *Grotius* on the place: *ſuſpectam nobis hanc "lectionem faciunt Interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs & Ambro-"ſius, qui omnes legerunt* ὃ ἐφανερώθη. I confeſs the *vulgar* Latin reads it "otherwiſe than the Greek, *Quod manifeſtatum eſt in carne*; and it "cannot be denied but the *Syriack*, however tranſlated by *Tremellius*, "agreeth with the Latin; and both ſeem to have read ὃ inſtead of "Θεὸς. But the joint conſent of the Greek Copies and Interpreters,

* "are

Chapter III.

" are above the Authority of these two Translators; and the *Arabick* " set forth in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, agreeth expressly with them. But " that which *Grotius* hath farther observed, is of far greater consider- " ation: *Addit Hincmarus Opusculo* lv. *illud* Θεὸς *hic positum a Nestori-* " *anis.* For if at first the Greeks read ὃ ἐφανερώθη, and that ὃ were " altered into Θεὸς by the *Nestorians*; then ought we to correct the " Greek Copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but " not so much as any ground or colour for our Arguments.

" But first it is no way probable that the *Nestorians* should find it " in the Original ὅ, and make it Θεὸς, because that by so doing they " had overthrown their own Assertion, which was, that *God* was not " incarnate, nor born of the *Virgin Mary*; that *God* did not ascend " unto Heaven, but *Christ*, by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, " ᾧ τὸν ἀναλημψιν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενον *Concil. Ephes. Part.* 1. *cap.* 17. Se- " condly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because " the Catholick Greeks read it Θεὸς before there were such Hereticks, " so called. *Nestoriani à Nestorio Episcopo, Patriarcha Constantinopo-* " *litano.* Aug. Hæres. *Nestorius*, from whom that Heresy began, " was Patriarch of *Constantinople* after *Sisinnius*, *Sisinnius* after *Atticus*, " *Atticus* after *Nectarius*, who succeeded *Joannes*, vulgarly called " *Chrysostomus.* But S. *Chrysostom* read not ὅ, but Θεὸς, as appears by " his Commentaries on the place; Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, τουτέστιν, ὁ " δημιουργός. And St. *Cyril*, who by all means opposed *Nestorius* upon " the first appearance of his Heresy, wrote two large Epistles to the " Queens *Pulcheria* and *Eudocia*, in both which he maketh great use of " this Text. In the first, after the repetition of the words, as they " are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus; τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανε- " ρωθείς; ἢ δῆλον, ὅτι πάντα τε ᾧ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος· ὅπου γὰρ ὑιὸς μία " τὸ τῆ ὑποστάσεως μυστήριον, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ. Wherefore in St. *Paul* he " reads Θεὸς *God*, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, " repeating the same Text *verbatim*, he manageth it thus against " *Nestorius*: Εἰ Θεὸς ὢν ὁ Λόγος ἀνανθρωπῆσαι λέγειν, ᾧ ὑ δύνασθαι μεθεὶς τὸ εἶναι " Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ἦν ἀεὶ διαμένων, μία δὴ τότε ᾧ ὁμολογουμένως μία ἐστὶ τὸ τῆ " ὑποστάσεως μυστήριον· εἰ ἓ ἀνθρωπος νοεῖται κοινὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, πῶς ἐν σαρκὶ πεφανέρω- " ται; καὶ τοι πῶς οὐκ ἄπαγε ἀναγκὴς, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαρκί τε ἐστὶ, ᾧ οὐκ ἄν " ἐτέρως ὀφθῆτό ποτ; And in the explanation of his second Anathematism, " he maketh use of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypostatical " Union, giving it this Gloss or Exposition: τί ἐστι τὸ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; " τουτέστι γέγονε πρὸς ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος, &c. The same he urgeth in his " *Scholion de Unigeniti incarnatione.* So also *Theodoret* contemporary with St. *Cyril*: Θεὸς γὰρ ὢν ᾧ Θεοῦ υἱὸς, ᾧ ἀληθῶς τῆ φύσει, δῆλος ἄπαγε

" ἀνανθρωπήσας

" ἀνθρωπίνας ἐχέτω, σαρκὸς γὰρ ἡμᾶς δύο φύσεις ἐδιδάξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὸν θεῖον Chapter
" ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν. Thirdly, *Hincmarus* does not say, that the *Neſto-* III.
" *rians* put Θεὸς into the Greek Text, but that he which put it in was
" caſt out of his Biſhoprick as a *Neſtorian*. His words are theſe:
" *Quidam nimirum ipſas Scripturas verbis inlicitis impoſturaverunt; ſicut*
" *Macedonius Conſtantinopolitanus Epiſcopus, qui ab Anaſtaſio Imperatore*
" *ideo a Civitate expulſus legitur, quoniam falſavit Evangelia, & illum*
" *Apoſtoli locum ubi dicit*, quod apparuit in carne, juſtificatum eſt in
" Spiritu, *per cognationem Græcarum literarum* O *in* Θ *hoc modo mutando*
" *falſavit. Ubi enim habuit* Qui, *hoc eſt* ΟΣ *monoſyllabum Græcum, li-*
" *tera mutata* O *in* Θ *vertit; & fecit* ΘΣ, *id eſt, ut eſſet* Deus apparuit
" per carnem. *Quapropter tanquam Neſtorianus fuit expulſus.* Hincm.
" *Opuſc.* lv. c. 18. Now whereas *Hincmarus* ſays *expulſus legitur*, we
" read not in *Evagrius*, or the *Excerpta* of *Theodorus*, or in *Joannes*
" *Malala*, that *Macedonius* was caſt out of his Biſhoprick for any ſuch
" falſation. It is therefore probable that he had it from *Liberatus*, a
" Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, who wrote a Breviary, collect-
" ed partly out of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, and Acts of the
" Councils, partly out of the relations of ſuch Men as he thought fit
" to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which,
" *chap.* 19. we have the ſame relation, only with this difference, that
" O is not turned into Θ, but into Ω; and ſo ΟΣ becomes not ΘΣ,
" but ΩΣ.

" So that, firſt the Greek Copies are not ſaid to have read it ὅ,
" but ὃς, and ſo not to have relation to the Myſtery, but to the Perſon
" of Chriſt; and therefore this makes nothing for the Vulgar Latin.
" Secondly, whereas *Hincmarus* ſays there was but one Letter chang-
" ed, no ſuch mutation can of ΟΣ make ΘΕΟΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we
" read in *Liberatus*; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text.
" Thirdly, *Macedonius* was no *Neſtorian*, but *Anaſtaſius* an *Eutychi-*
" *an*; and he ejected him not as he did other Catholick Biſhops, under
" the pretence of Neſtorianiſm, but for other reaſons. However
" *Macedonius* could not falſify all the Greek Copies, when as well
" thoſe which were before his time, as thoſe which were written
" ſince, all acknowledg Θεὸς. And if he had been ejected for ſubſti-
" tuting Θεὸς, without queſtion *Anaſtaſius* would have taken care for
" the reſtoring ὃς, which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth
" therefore that the *Neſtorians* did not falſify the Text, by reading
" Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, but that the antient Greek Fathers read it ſo; and
" conſequently being the Greek is the Original, this Lection muſt be
" acknowledged Authentical.

This

Chapter IV.

This is excellently said by the learned *Doctor*, but he is mistaken when he denies that any Greek Copy reads ὅ, unless we are deceived by the *Oxford* Edition, which sets down the various Lections, and wherein the *Clarimont Copy*, of great Antiquity, and another of *Lincoln College*, are said to have ὅ, which the Latin and Syriack Interpreters undoubtedly found in their Greek Testaments.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 8. *Note* d. I Am plainly of the mind that St. *Paul* here despises bodily Exercises, as altogether unprofitable to Salvation, for of that profitableness he here speaks, because he considers them apart from Piety, which he opposes to them; and if they are abstracted from that, they do not serve for *few things*, but for nothing at all. For let those who are destitute of true Piety exercise their Bodies as much as they please, it will never avail them any thing as to eternal Salvation. For who will believe that the *Brachmans*, [for instance] who live an austere Life in the Woods, and abstain from many lawful things, for ostentation sake, or out of superstition, are any thing more acceptable to God than the other *Indians*, who do not think such Abstinences necessary? If we use those bodily Exercises, on purpose to make our selves fitter for the performance of some Duties of real Piety, then it must be granted that they are not profitable πρὸς ὀλίγον but πρὸς πολλά: and therefore St. *Paul* does not here consider *that* use of corporal Exercises, but that which does not render Men more fit for the practice of Vertue. He would have commended *Socrates*, *qui inter labores voluntarios, & exercitia corporis, ad fortuitas patientiæ vices firmandi, stare solitus dicitur perdius atque pernox, à summo lucis ortu ad solem alterum orientem: Who is said to have continued whole Nights and Days from the Sun's first rising, till it rose again, in voluntary Labours and bodily Exercises, to harden himself to undergo whatever it might be his lot to suffer.* Which are the words of *A. Gellius* in Lib. ii. c. 1. Thus *Socrates* behaved himself, that he might become the more stedfast in Vertue, and that the fear of bodily pain might never remove him from it. But St. *Paul* would not have praised the patience of a Robber, who exercised his Body that he might be the more fit for spoil, and harden himself against the fear of suffering for his Crimes, no more than the exercises of the *Athletæ*, which were performed only out a desire of vain glory.

Vers. 10. Ὅς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.] These words our Author, after others, interprets of eternal Salvation; but I rather understand

underſtand them of a deliverance from temporal Dangers, out of which God often reſcues *all Men, but eſpecially thoſe who put their truſt in him.* St. *Paul's* meaning is this: that he did not refuſe to expoſe himſelf to the greateſt Dangers, Reproaches, or Perſecutions; becauſe he knew that God could reſcue him out of all thoſe dangers if he pleaſed. He has a reſpect to *Pſalm* xvii. 7. where the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks thus: *Make thy loving kindneſs marvellous, O thou Saviour,* חסים, which may be rendred *of them that believe*; for *to hope* and *believe*, when the Diſcourſe is about a thing which is matter of Joy, and that yet future, ſignify almoſt the ſame thing. So, as others have obſerved, God is ſaid *to ſave Man and Beaſt*, in *Pſalm* xxxvi. 6. So the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom*, chap. xvi. 7. ſpeaking of thoſe who looked up to the brazen Serpent, and were healed, ſays, *he that turned himſelf was not ſaved,* ἐσῴζετο, *by that which was ſeen, but by thee the Saviour,* σωτῆρα, *of all Men.* Chapter V.

Verſ. 15. I will not deny but the word μελετᾷν is uſed in an *Agoniſtical* ſenſe; but there being nothing ſaid here of thoſe Exerciſes, I rather think it ought to be rendered *mind*, or *take care* of theſe things; ſo as that μελέτα ſhould be the ſame with μὴ ἀμέλει, *do not neglect*, which went before. So, μελέτη, in *Heſiod*, ſignifies *care*, Ἔργ. verſ. 380.

Πλείων μὲν πλείων μελέτη, μείζων δ' ὄλβοιο.

Where ſaith *Proclus*: μελέτην λέγει τὴν φροντίδα, *ſo he calls care.* And μελετᾶν in the ſame Poet is uſed for *to take care*, as in *verſ.* 316.

——μελετᾷς βίᾳ ὅς σε κελεύω:

I know in Proſe the word rarely occurs in this ſignification, but as long as it very well agrees to this place, nothing ſhould hinder us to admit it. Out of this, which is the proper ſignification of the Verb μελετᾶν, as appears by its coming from μέλει, reſulted that other mention'd by Dr. *Hammond*; for they that exerciſe themſelves in any buſineſs, are careful and diligent about it.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 17. Note d. I. Τιμὴ ſignifies unqueſtionably ſometimes *Wages* or *Reward*, according to the ſignification of the Verb τίω or τίνω, for *to pay* or *requite*, and I doubt not too, but διπλῆ τιμῆ here muſt be interpreted *double Wages*. But the other pla-

Chapter V.

ces alledged by our Author, to prove that τιμὴν signifies to *reward*, or ſomething of that kind, do not ſeem to prove it. For tho there were Rewards joined with the *Honours* there ſpoken of, it does not follow that the word τιμὴν is expreſſive of thoſe Rewards, which undoubtedly were not the τιμὴ *Honour* it ſelf, but an outward ſignification of Honour, and are joined with Honour, as its Conſectaries.

II. It is true alſo, what our Author ſays about the Verb ἀξιοῦσθαι; but here it ſeems to ſignify not only *to receive*, but alſo *to be judged worthy to receive*, which is the moſt uſual ſignification of the word. In the place of the *Expoſition of the Faith*, printed with the Works of *Juſtin*, ἠξίωνται is not ſimply *they have* or *have had*, but they *have been endued with that dignity* or excellency of Nature *as to be partakers of the ſame Divinity*. That is the perpetual ſignification of the word, which is hardly ever uſed but in a good ſenſe, and to ſignify that he, of whom it is ſaid, enjoys that of which he is worthy.

Verſ. 22. *Note* g. Dr. *Hammond*, in this Annotation, has ingeniouſly cleared the order of the Diſcourſe, but has omitted one thing, which he ought firſt of all to have proved; *viz.* That the *Gnoſticks* forbad not only *Matrimony*, but the uſe of *Wine*. For tho the former be univerſally charged upon them, yet I cannot tell whether any did ever accuſe them of prohibiting the uſe of Wine. It is certain neither *Irenæus* nor *Epiphanius* object any ſuch thing againſt them; and later Writers we need not trouble our ſelves about, who for the moſt part copy after them. Tho thoſe Fathers omit nothing, whereby they may render the *Gnoſticks* infamous and odious, ſo that we can ſcarce believe all they ſay. Nay, there is a paſſage in *Epiphanius*, which if true, ſhews the *Gnoſticks* did not abſtain from Wine; in *Hæreſ.* xxvi. which is that of the *Gnoſticks*, Sect. 5. where he ſpeaks thus: Τὰ σώματα δὲ αὐτῶν νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν, τιμελεῖσθαι γυναικείαν, καὶ ἀνθρωπείαν, μυρίζεσθαι, λούεσθαι, στεναζεσθαι, κοίτην δὲ καὶ μίξεις ἀρρένων καὶ θηλέων. καὶ καταρᾶσθαι τὴν νηστείαν, λέγοντες, ὅτι δεῖ πάσχειν, τῷ γὰρ ἄρχοντι τούτου τοῦ παντὸς ἡ κτίσις ἐστὶν ἡ νηστεία. δεῖ δὲ τρέφεσθαι εἰς τὸ τὰ σώματα ἕξαι ἰσχυρά, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἐν καιρῷ ἀποδιδόναι, ὃν καιρὸν αὐτῶν: *Night and day ſorry Fellows and Wenches employ themſelves in taking care of their Bodies, anointing, waſhing, feaſting, whoring, and making themſelves drunk. And they curſe all that faſt, ſaying, that People ought not to faſt, becauſe faſting belongs to the Maker and Prince of this Age; and they muſt feed, that their Bodies may be ſtrong, and able to bring forth fruit in its proper ſeaſon.* There were indeed afterwards other Hereticks, who taught it was unlawful to drink Wine, as the *Encratites*, as we are told by *Epiphanius* in Hæreſ. xlvii. But *all* the Doctrines of *all* Hereticks cannot be attributed to the ſingle Sect of the *Gnoſticks*; unleſs perhaps the *Gnoſticks* were of ſeveral ſorts.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. IT is ſtrange that thoſe who have written about the Hereſy of the *Gnoſticks*, did not upbraid them with this, That they attempted to deprive Maſters of their Servants; and I do not well underſtand why Dr. *Hammond*, if any Vice be reproved, preſently imputes it to the *Gnoſticks*, without any Authority from the Antients. By this way of interpreting, a wide door is opened for innumerable Fictions.

Verſ. 19. *Note* h. St. *Paul* ſeems to have attributed to the word θημέλιον, from τιθέναι, the ſame ſignification as to the word κειμήλιον, from κεῖσθαι *to lye*, *viz.* in a Storehouſe, unleſs it is to be read in this place κειμείλιον, which is a very uſual word, whereas the former no where occurs in the notion of a *Treaſure* or a pretious thing. It is certain there is no great difference between ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΝ and ΚΕΙΜΗΛΙΟΝ, for inſtead of θημέλιον the Greeks uſe alſo θημείλιον.

Verſ. 20. *Note* i. Seeing the word γνῶσις ſignified Knowledg, and ſuch Knowledg as the *Jews* boaſted they had received not from the Scriptures, but by Tradition from their Anceſtors; there is no doubt but Men endued with that ſort of Knowledg might be called γνωστικοί, *Gnoſticks*. But it may not without reaſon be doubted, whether even from the Apoſtles time that name was peculiarly attributed to one particular Sect of Heathens, who feigned themſelves to have embraced the Chriſtian Religion, and that owed its beginning to *Simon Magus*, as it was afterwards. Our Author has not ſaid any thing to prove this latter; and I have elſewhere obſerved many things which overthrow his Conjectures. I am apt to think, the *Gnoſticks* of the Apoſtles times were *Jews*, either by Birth or Profeſſion, who becauſe they converſed among the *Greeks*, mixed a great many things out of their Philoſophy with the *Jewiſh* Divinity, and by that mungril Doctrine interpreted Scripture and Religion. Afterwards the name of *Gnoſticks* was appropriated to a certain Sect of Heathens mention'd by *Irenæus* and *Epiphanius*.

In *Barnabas*, the word γνῶσις is more than once uſed in a good ſenſe for the knowledg of the myſtical ſenſe of Scripture. In *chap.* vi. after he had alledged words out of *Moſes* in *Exod.* xxxiii. 1. and *Lev.* xx. 24. in which the *Jews* are commanded to enter into the Land of *Canaan*, he preſently ſubjoins; Τὶ λέγει δὲ ἡ γνῶσις, μάθετε. ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανερῶσθαι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν: *and underſtand, what ſaith Knowledg: hope in Jeſus, who is to be manifeſted to you in the fleſh.* After-

Chapter VI. wards he interprets the words of *Moſes* allegorically, and ſays that by the *Land* was meant *Jeſus*. See alſo *Chap.* x. towards the end, where that word occurs twice in this ſignification. Some perſons ſeem, as they eaſily might, to have abuſed that way of interpreting, whoſe knowledg St. *Paul* here calls ἀναστροφὴν γνώσεως, and to whom he often alludes in this Epiſtle. But we muſt beware of ſeeking ſuch Alluſions where it is not neceſſary, as our Author does in many places, who yet ſometimes ſeems to have hit the nail on the head, as in *Chap.* iv. 4. *& ſeqq.*

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

On the Second Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to *Timothy*.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] Notwithſtanding all that is here ſaid by our Author, it is much more probable that St. *Paul* wrote this Epiſtle after his laſt Bondage, in the year of *Nero* XIII. and of *Chriſt* LXVII. a little before his death; as it is thought by Dr. *Pearſon*, who has eaſily ſolved all the Difficulties which our Author here objects againſt that Opinion. I ſhall ſay ſomething to them on *Chap.* iv.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 3. Χάριν ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ ——— ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ μνείαν, ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσί μου.] The ſenſe of theſe words ſeems to be this; *I thank God*, that he gives me cauſe *to make perpetual mention of you in my Prayers*; that is, becauſe thou adhereſt to the Goſpel: for the Apoſtle did expreſly make mention of thoſe in his Prayers for whom he had a particular Affection, and whom he knew to be faithful to Chriſt. This may be gather'd from the beginning of moſt of his Epiſtles. See eſpecially that to *Philemon*, verſ. 4, and 5.

Verſ. 9. Χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων.] That is, ἣν πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων προέθετο ἡμῖν δοθῆναι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *which of a long time God had purpoſed to give us by Jeſus Chriſt.* He means the Goſpel, which God had purpoſed ſhould be preached both to Jews and Gentiles, as appears from *verſ.* 10. That αἰωνίοις χρόνοις is uſed for *a long time*, is evident from *Tit.* i. 2. where ſee our Author, and *Grotius* upon this place. And that is ſaid to be given, which is by a certain and immutable Counſel *decreed* to be given. So *Virgil*, Æneid. 1. *verſ.* 282. repreſents *Jupiter* ſpeaking thus concerning the *Romans*:

His ego nec metas rerum, nec tempora pono,
Imperium ſine fine DEDI.

See Note on *Epheſ.* i. 4.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 16. Note b. THE place in *Tertullian* is in *Chap.* xxxiii. de *Præſcr. Hæret.* where he ſpeaks thus: *Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negatores & dubitatores reſurrectionis. Hæc opinio propria Sadducæorum. Partem ejus uſurpat Marcion & Apelles & Valentinus.* *St.* Paul *in his firſt to the* Corinthians *marks thoſe who denied or doubted of the Reſurrection. This opinion was peculiar to the* Sadduces. *Part of it is eſpouſed by* Marcion, *&c.* And a little after: *Æque tangit eos, qui dicerent factam jam reſurrectionem, id de ſe Valentiniani aſſeverant: He likewiſe takes up thoſe that ſaid the Reſurrection was already paſt, which the* Valentinians *affirm of themſelves.* The reſt which our Author ſays in this Annotation about the Verb νέμω and its Derivatives, and about ἀκέσματα, is a mere Medley, and perfectly uſeleſs, I will not ſay to thoſe that underſtand the Greek Language, but thoſe alſo who can conſult *Lexicons*, in which they may find theſe words more largely and better explained than they are here. I ſhall note only a few things concerning them.

I. Becauſe while Cattel νέμουσι *are feeding*, they wander out of one place into another, therefore νέμεσθαι ſometimes ſignifies *to wander*, as on the contrary the Latin word *errare* ſignifies *to feed*, as in that Verſe of *Virgil*:

Mille meæ Siculis errant in montibus agnæ.

The ſame I may ſay of the Hebrew רעה, which we find in *Numb.* xiv. 3. where the *Vulg. Interp.* renders the word רעים *robim* by *vagos, Wanderers.* The *Nomades* in *Scythia*, and the *Numidians* in *Africa*, were really both *Shepherds* and *Wanderers*, ſo that they might be denominated from both; which every one knows. But what is that to the νομὴ of a Gangrene? Our Author ought to have produced Examples, which ſhewed that νομὴ is taken for the eating of a ſpreading Ulcer, of which there are ſeveral given by *H. Stephanus.* The Doctor alledges a Verſe as out of *Heſiod*, which is *Homers*, in *Iliad.* Υ. v. 249. where ἐπέων νομὰς is *a profuſion of words, with which any one feeds himſelf*, as *Euſtathius* on that place obſerves. Yet that word occurs in *Heſiod* in the ſame ſenſe, in Ἔργ. *verſ.* 403. where the Poet admoniſhes *Perſa*, that if he did not labour, there would come a time when he ſhould beg with a great many words in vain:

Ἀχρεῖος δ' ἔσται ἐπέων νομὰς ——

A profuſion of words will be uſeleſs.

II.

II. There was no need of recurring to the *Septuagint*, to shew that the Verb περίστημι signifies sometimes *to shun*, that being the use of it in the best Greek Writers, as *Lexicographers* will shew. And therefore περίστημι signifies *to shun*, because if we meet with any thing in our way which we would not run upon, and we cannot remove, we *go round about it*. Or if we would come nearer the proper signification of the Verb ἵστημι, περίστασθαι will be *to stand about*, that is, to stand still when we meet with any stumbling block, for fear of falling upon it. *Suidas* interprets περιστάμενος by φεύγων *flying from* or *avoiding*; and then he produces the place concerning *Moses* alledged by our Author, Περιέστη, ὁ ὄχλον γὰρ ἀεὶ καὶ τὰς ταραχὰς περιέστη μάλιστα: *he always avoided a multitude, and Tumults especially.* Chapter III.

CHAP. III.

WHat our Author says here about *Simon*'s Contest and Flying, he took out of *Cæsar Baronius*, as also other things of no great moment. See *Baron. Annal.* ad *A.C.* LXVIII. of *Nero* the 12*th*. But these things I have already elsewhere confuted. See especially what I have said on 2 *Thess.* ii. 3. I shall only add, that the place which our Author refers to in *Suetonius* does not at all belong to this matter: it is in Chap. 12. *of the Life of* Nero, and the words are these: *Inter Pyrrhicarum argumenta, Taurus Pasiphaen ligneo juvencæ simulacro abditam iniit, ut multi spectantium crediderunt. Icarus primo statim conatu juxta cubiculum ejus decidit, ipsumq; cruore respersit. Among the Arguments of the* Pyrrich *Sports* (which *Nero* represented to the People) *a Bull covered* Pasiphae *inclosed in an Engine of Wood made in the shape of an Heifer. One that acted the part of* Icarus *immediately upon the first attempt fell down near the Emperor's Pavilion, and sprinkled him with his blood.* What is there here about the Contest of *Simon* with S. *Peter?* Who does not see that *Suetonius* speaks of a poor miserable Wretch that was forced to attempt flying to make the People a show? We may be sure if any such Conflict had passed before *Nero* and the People, in the Amphitheatre, the fame of it would have been so great among the Heathens, that it would never have been forgotten. But these are the Fables of some idle Christians, which Posterity greedily took up.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 6. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι.] Tho σπένδεσθαι is properly ſaid of the Wine which was poured out upon the Head of the Sacrifice; yet here I think it ought to be underſtood metaphorically of the Sacrifice it ſelf, upon which the Wine is poured out, a little before it is killed. So *Heſychius*: Σπένδεται, θύεται. Σπένδομαι, θύομαι. St. *Paul* uſes the *Preſent* Tenſe, becauſe of the nearneſs of the danger, as the Particle ἤδη *now* ſhews. Our Author forces this place, when he interprets it of a paſt danger.

Ibid. Ἐφίστημι.] This indeed is a Verb in the *Preterperfect* Tenſe, but it is very frequently taken for the *Preſent*; whence the Vulgar Interpreter, and almoſt all others, render it *inſtat, is at hand*. And that it is to be ſo underſtood, the foregoing words ſhew. So that our Author had no reaſon to interpret it in the *Preterperfect* Tenſe, in his Premonition and Paraphraſe of this Verſe.

Verſ. 7. *Note* a. It is true indeed, that St. *Paul* here uſes Agoniſtical words; but as the Crown was due not to him who was yet running, but who was come to the end of his race, and that before others, ſo alſo God beſtows a Crown not on him that behaves himſelf manfully in any particular Calamity, but during his whole Life. So that what St. *Paul* calls a *good Combat*, is the whole courſe of his Life, which he tells *Timothy* he had *finiſhed* τετελεκέναι, becauſe he knew his Death was near, as the foregoing Verſe ſufficiently ſhews. What our Author ſays in his Note on *Acts* xxi. 7. I have confuted already on that place. See 1 *Tim.* vi. 12. and *Acts* xx. 24.

The word δικαιοσύνης ſeems here to be in the place of an *Adjective*, ſo as that, according to a known Hebraiſm, *a Crown of Righteouſneſs* ſhould be put for a *righteous* or *juſt Crown*, that is, a Crown juſtly due. This is confirmed by the Epithet *Juſt* added to the word *Judg*. The places which our Author produces, as if the Hebrew צדקה ſignified in them *Felicity*, I might ſhew to be improperly alledged, if it would contribute any thing to the illuſtration of St. *Paul's* words.

Verſ. 9. Σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με ταχέως.] It is certain indeed that *Timothy* was preſent with St. *Paul* when he made his firſt Defence, but whether he could go again to *Rome* ſoon enough, to be there before St. *Paul's* Death, is ſomewhat queſtionable.

Verſ. 10. Ἀγαπήσας τὸν αἰῶνα.] Our Author will not have *Demas* to have revolted from the Faith, but only, forſaking his Office of preaching the Goſpel, to have applied himſelf to worldly Affairs. But to *love* the

the present age, signifies something worse than that, *viz.* to prefer it before the future; which he that forsakes an Office, which he finds himself insufficient for, does not. See *Matt.* xiii. 22. and *James* iv. 4. Chapter IV.

Vers. 13. *Note* b. The *Etymologicon Magnum* hath it so, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks the words of *Phavorinus* should be read; but in this matter I neither believe the Writer of the *Etymologicon* nor *Phavorinus*, because φελόνη is not a Greek word, and signifies no such thing in the Latin Tongue. See *Grotius*.

Vers. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεὺς πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο.] Dr. *Hammond* thinks St. *Paul* here has a reference to the Troubles he endured at *Ephesus*, mention'd in *Acts* xix. but neither is it from that place sufficiently evident what *Alexander* did against St. *Paul*; and if he did any thing, I do not think the Apostle here has a respect to that, but something which was done at *Rome*: for this *Alexander* seems to have gone from *Asia* to *Rome*, where he fiercely opposed S. *Paul*, and from thence returned to *Asia*; for which reason St. *Paul* here admonishes *Timothy* to beware of him.

Vers. 16. Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου Ἀπολογίᾳ, &c.] This cannot be understood of that Defence which St. *Paul* made for himself when he was first in bonds: for undoubtedly he would not have told *Timothy* a thing which he already very well knew, as having been present with him at that time, nor have said what was nothing to the purpose. He speaks of his pleading before *him* whom *Nero* at his departure into *Greece* left Governour of the City of *Rome*, by whom he was not presently condemned, but yet kept still in bonds, perhaps till *Nero*'s Return, by which means many in the mean time had the Gospel preached to them. See *Grotius* on the following Verse, by whom it will appear, it was not well understood by our Author, in his *Premonition* to this Epistle.

Vers. 17. *Note* d. The *mouth of the Lion* does not, it's true, signify *Nero*, who seems at that time to have been in *Greece*, but *Helius*, to whom *Nero* committed the Government of *Rome* during his Absence. See Dr. *Pearson* in his *Annal. Paulin. ad* A. C. LXVII.

Vers. 18. Ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος.] These words are alledged by our Author in his *Premonition*, to prove that St. *Paul* here speaks of a *Danger* he was deliver'd from. But the Apostle does not add ἀπὸ τῦ κινδύνου τέτου, but ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, that is, as *Grotius* well interprets it, from doing any thing unworthy of a Christian, or unworthy of an Apostle. This is clear from the next words, *and will preserve me to his heavenly Kingdom*; as Dr. *Pearson* also has observed.

Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to *Titus*.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] Dr. *Pearſon* with more reaſon refers the writing of this Epiſtle to the Year lxv. in which alſo St. *Paul* wrote his firſt to *Timothy*. It is probable, *Titus* remained in *Crete*, under the name of an *Evangeliſt* rather than of a *Biſhop* or *Archbiſhop* (a word then unknown, as well as the thing it ſelf;) becauſe St. *Paul* afterwards commanded him to meet him at *Nicopolis*, as appears from *Chap.* iii. 12. and after that he went to *Dalmatia*, as St. *Paul* tells us in 2 *Tim.* iv. 10. undoubtedly to perform there the Office of an *Evangeliſt*. Which Function can hardly conſiſt with the Office of a Biſhop, watching over the Flock committed to him, with that care and diligence he ought. The Teſtimonies of the Antients about this matter, who judged raſhly of the times of the Apoſtles by their own, and ſpake of them in the Language of their own Age, are of little moment; and ſo do no more prove that *Titus* was Biſhop of the Iſland of *Crete*, than what Dr. *Hammond* ſays, proves him to have been dignified with the Title of an *Archbiſhop*. So the Antients very unanimouſly affirmed that St. *Peter* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*; but the more judicious ſort of Perſons preſently diſcovered them to be in an Error.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. IT deſerved to be noted, that in this one Verſe, the word αἰώνιος is taken in two ſeveral ſenſes; for ζωὴ αἰώνιος ſignifies *eternal Life*, that is, which ſhall never have any end; but χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, *eternal times*, is no more than *antient* times. This is a uſual thing with St. *Paul*, of which ſee what I have ſaid in my *Ars Critica*, P. 2. S. 1. c. 6.

Verſ.

Verſ. 12. *Note* c. I. I do not believe *Phavorinus* read theſe words otherwiſe than we, but rather ſet them down as he remembred them. It is an improper Etymology which our Author gives of the word γαστριμαργὸς, wherein contrary to all Analogy, μ is inſerted between two words. *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives us a much better interpretation of it, in *Pædag.* Lib. ii. c. 1. Ἡ γαστριμαργία, ἀκρασία ἐστὶ τῶν τεττάρων, ἃς δὴ καὶ τάττουσι σοφισταί, μανία ὅτι γαστὴρ· ἀπὸ μάργου ὁ μαινόμενος: *it is an intemperance about Food, and as the word literally ſignifies, a madneſs in the Belly, for* μάργος *ſignifies Mad.* This Etymology is ſuggeſted alſo by *Phavorinus*, which I wonder our Author did not take notice of. Chapter II.

II. The word ἀργὸς both in *Epimenides* and in St. *Paul*, ſignifies what it ordinarily ſignifies, that is, *idle* and *ſlothful*, as Gluttons uſually are. It's true, Slothfulneſs and Gluttony are very often attended with Uncleanneſs, but Idleneſs and Uncleanneſs are not therefore the ſame. In *Ezekiel*, *Idleneſs* does not ſignify Uncleanneſs, but that which is the cauſe of it: *Behold*, ſaith he, *this was the Iniquity of thy Siſter* Sodom, *Pride, fulneſs of Bread, and abundance of Idleneſs was in her*, &c.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. BY a compariſon of this place with 1 *Tim.* iii. our Author has well ſhewn that the Diſcourſe here is about Deacons; but there are two things he will hardly perſwade thoſe that underſtand Greek, and are exerciſed in the reading of theſe Books to believe. *One* is that πρεσβύτης is diſtinguiſhed from the word πρεσβύτερος, both thoſe words being promiſcuouſly uſed in the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, as well when they ſignify Dignity, as Age, as *Kircher's Concordances* will ſhew. The word πρεσβύτης is taken for a Judg in *Iſa.* iii. 2. *Lament.* ii. 21. & v. 14. and πρεσβύτερος for the ſame in *Levit.* iv. 15. *Num.* xvi. 25. and elſewhere often. And ſo in many places both theſe words are uſed for an old Man. The degrees of Compariſon ought not to be urged, againſt the perpetual uſe of the Language, eſpecially πρεσβύτης & πρεσβύτεροι being properly ſaid with a reſpect to younger or young. As theſe two laſt words ſignify the ſame, ſo likewiſe the two former; and the two laſt, as *Logicians* ſpeak, are *correlates* to the two firſt. They are uſed alſo indifferently in the *New Teſtament*. Compare *Philem.* 9. with 2 *John* 1. & 3 *John* 1.

The *other* is, that the word νεώτεροι in *verſ.* 6. ſignifies Believers, who have no Office in the Church. It ſignifies only young *Men*, as the word νέαι ſignifies before *Women*. See what I have oppoſed to Dr. *Hammond* on *Luke* xxii. 26.

Chapter III.

Verſ. 3. *Note* b. Tho καταστῶσι be *to ordain* or *conſtitute*, it does not follow that κατάστημα ſignifies the *rank* of thoſe who are conſtituted in any certain Office. For nothing is more common than for Derivatives to depart from the ſignification of their Primitives. So that the uſe of a word muſt always be joined with Analogy and Etymology; unleſs perhaps it be a *ſingular* word, or the ſeries of the Diſcourſe ſhews it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood in a particular ſenſe. But neither does the ſeries of the Diſcourſe in this place favour our Author, and Uſe is evidently againſt him. The Deaconeſſes are commanded to be ἱεροπρεπεῖς ἐν τῷ καταστήματι, that is, to go in ſuch a dreſs, and behave themſelves in ſuch a manner as became Women conſecrated to God. This very well agrees with the whole ſeries of the Diſcourſe; and Uſe conſtantly interprets κατάστημα of a *dreſs*, *habit*, or *geſture of Body*. Conſult *J. C. Suicerus* in his *Theſaurus Eccleſiaſticus*, or any other *Lexicographer*.

Verſ. 13. Περσδιχόμενος —— τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆ δόξης τῦ μεγάλυ Θεῦ.] A Gentleman of great reading, who publiſhed ſome years ago Notes and Obſervations on the Epiſtle of *Polycarp*, thinks St. *Paul* here ſo alludes to the *Cabiri*, or great Gods that were worſhipped not only among the *Samothracians*, but alſo in the Iſle of *Crete*, as to oppoſe Chriſt to them. And it is certain כביר *chebir* in *Arabick*, ſignifies *great*, and thence the Greek word κάβειρος ſeems to have been formed, as *S. Bochart* well conjectured. Thoſe Gods alſo were thought by ſome to be the ſame with the *Corybantes*, which every one knows were very much worſhipped in *Crete*. And there was a mighty talk concerning their ἐπιφάνεια, as well as of other Gods, as the learned Gentleman before mentioned has largely proved. But I think there is more wit than truth in this Interpretation, there being nothing in St. *Paul*'s words that ſhews he had a reſpect to the Religion of the *Cretes*; for if there be, it muſt be ſomething elſe beſides the words ἐπιφάνειας & μεγάλυ Θεῦ, *appearance* and *of the great God*, which were often in the mouth of the *Jews*, without any alluſion to the Iſle of *Crete* or its Gods. See the Greek *Index* of *Kircher*'s *Concordances*.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 10. *Note* b. Αἱρετικὸς properly is the ſame with αἱρετίσης, that is, he that follows any αἵρεσις *Sect*, whether its Doctrins are true or falſe. But the Doctrins of the Apoſtolical Churches, govern'd by the Apoſtles, or by Apoſtolical Men, that

that agreed with their Teachers, being true; whoever departed from their αἵρεσις (that word being underſtood in a good ſenſe) did by conſequence maintain falſe Doctrins. And hence Perſons of erroneous Opinions, whether they were ſuch as deſired to live in the Church provided they might be tolerated, or whether they choſe to ſeparate themſelves from it, were afterwards called *Hereticks*. But as there is a difference to be made between Men and Times, ſo alſo between Hereticks; and therefore this Precept of St. *Paul* muſt not be urged beyond what he intended it. Whoever heretofore departed from the Apoſtles, did by that very thing deny themſelves to be Chriſtians, becauſe they contradicted inſpired Men, from whom alone the Chriſtian Doctrin could be learned, and whoſe Authority was confirmed by Miracles. Thoſe undoubtedly were to be avoided by Chriſtians, who when they had believed the Apoſtles, did afterwards reject their Doctrin and follow other Teachers. But thoſe who after the Governors of Churches were not inſpired, nor endued with a Power of working Miracles, ſeemed to themſelves to obſerve in the Churches a departure from the Apoſtles in things themſelves, tho they were cunningly diſſembled, and requeſted a reformation of thoſe Errors from the Governors of Churches; theſe, I ſay, were not any longer αἱρετικοὶ to be avoided, if they could truly charge others with dangerous Errors and Tyranny. Theſe cannot have that μορμολύκειον *bugbear name* of the *Church* objected to them, as if the greateſt number which are qualified with that name, could not by degrees at leaſt fall off from the Doctrin of the Apoſtles; and all that ſeparated from it muſt neceſſarily be in a ſtate of Damnation. Chapter III.

Ibid. *Note* c. I. Beſides the difference which our Author has obſerved between this place and the words of *Chriſt* in *Mat.* xviii. there is this further obſervable, that *there* Chriſt ſpeaks of an injury done to any private Man, and which if it endamaged him, it was only with relation to his private Affairs; but *here* the Diſcourſe is about a departure from the Apoſtles Doctrin, which concerned both the Apoſtles and the whole Church; in which caſe one or two Admonitions might be ſufficient, to know whether thoſe who ſeparated themſelves from the Churches, would again return to them. Yet I do not think the words of St. *Paul* are to be taken ſo, as if he forbad ſuch Men to be admoniſhed a third time, before they were avoided, if there was any hope of reclaiming them. He only ſays *after the firſt and ſecond Admonition*, to ſhew Chriſtians that Men are not to be given over for loſt preſently after the firſt Admonition, but to be

 often

Chapter III. often admoniſhed. Surely Chriſtian Charity will not allow us to number St. *Paul*'s words ſo, as if after two Admonitions, without any regard had to Circumſtances, it were neceſſary to proceed to Excommunication. Here are no Lawyers forms, in which Words are weighed, and Citations counted; but only a repreſſing of an overhaſty Judgment, that no one might be condemned unheard, or given up too ſoon.

II. As in *Mat.* xviii. 17. *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen and a Publican*, does not ſignify Excommunicate him, for the Diſcourſe is about any private Men, who had not the power of Excommunication: ſo alſo in this place, παραιτοῦ is not to *Excommunicate*, but do not any longer converſe with him, after ſeveral Admonitions given him to no purpoſe, avoid him. It is plain this is the proper ſignification of the word παραιτοῦ, nor can it be applied to Excommunication, unleſs the thing it ſelf requires it. But here there is no neceſſity of its being taken in that ſenſe, becauſe an *Heretick* was ſelf-excommunicate, and becauſe he made a new Sect, and did not look upon Excommunication as a Puniſhment. *Sinners* who deſire to continue in the Church notwithſtanding their ſinful practices, are excommunicated, that they may be reclaimed to a more Holy Life, when they ſee they cannot be accounted Members of the Church as long as they live wickedly; not thoſe who voluntarily ſeparate, and will no longer communicate with the Church. The following words confirm this interpretation, which is alſo *Grotius*'s.

III. I have ſhewn on 2 *Cor.* xiii. that that place of St. *Paul* is wreſted by our Author, and I will not repeat what I have there ſaid.

Verſ. 11. *Note* d. Here our Author does not ſeem to be ſufficiently conſiſtent with himſelf, having before interpreted παραιτεῖσθαι *to avoid* of Excommunication; beſides, he does not clearly enough ſhew what is meant by αὐτοκατάκριτος, becauſe he confounds the preſent Churches with the Apoſtolical, which in that Age agreed with their Teachers. Αὐτοκατάκριτος here is one who forſaking the Apoſtolical and Chriſtian Aſſemblies, did by that very thing deny himſelf to be a Chriſtian, and therefore ought not any longer to be accounted a Chriſtian by his own judgment. He was to be avoided therefore by Chriſtians, of whoſe number he denied himſelf any longer to be. But now there are a great many who are called by other Chriſtians by the hateful names of *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, who yet cannot be ſaid to be αὐτοκατάκριτοι, becauſe they endeavour as much as others, to underſtand the Doctrin and Precepts of Chriſt, and conform themſelves to them, and no leſs hope to be ſaved by the Grace of Chriſt alone. In this imperfect ſtate of Mortality, many Errors creep into mens Minds through ignorance,

norance, or prejudice and weakneſs of Judgment, who live no leſs Chriſtianly, as to other things, than thoſe that are free from ſuch Errors. And it would be very unjuſt to call ſuch αὐτοκατάκριτοι, becauſe they ſeparate from others. Again, they who denied themſelves to be Chriſtians, could not complain if they were avoided by the Chriſtians; but one that charges others with what he thinks to be Error, and cannot be preſent at their Aſſemblies, unleſs he approve them, and therefore abſents himſelf from them, but yet does not avoid the Men themſelves, or treat them leſs Chriſtianly, is highly injured, if equal courteſy be not ſhewn him. This which was plain of it ſelf, I thought fit to ſay in a few words, becauſe our Author did not ſeem clearly enough to explain the mind of the Apoſtle; not that I deſigned to handle the thing as it deſerves.

Verſ. 14. *Note* f. In the place of the *Acts* χρεία is *a buſineſs*, not *a providing of neceſſaries for Life*. See *Grotius* on that place.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to *Philemon.*

AT the end of the *Premon.*] I have obſerved on the Premonition before the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, that that Epiſtle ſeems to have been written, according to the account of the moſt exact Chronologers, in the Year of *Chriſt* lxii, or the ixth of *Nero.*

Verſ. 12. Τὰ ἴδια σπλάγχνα.] That is, my Son; for St. *Paul* accounted all thoſe he had converted to the Faith of Chriſt, his Children; and it is uſual for Children to be called the *Bowels* of their Parents. So *Cepheus* in *Ovid.* Met. Lib. v. Fab. 1. ſpeaking of his Daughter *Andromeda:*

Sed quæ viſceribus *veniebat Belluа ponto*
Exſaturanda meis.

ANNO

Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epiſtle

Of St. *Paul* the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews*.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 2. Δι' ὃν καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.] He hath appointed Jeſus Heir or Lord of all things, *by whom alſo he made the Worlds*; that is, having heretofore by that Λόγῳ *Reaſon*, or eternal Wiſdom which reſided in *Jeſus*, and was moſt nearly united to him, createdall things. In the Paraphraſe, that which diſtinctly agreed to each of theſe, ſhould have been diſtinctly expreſſed, that the meaning of the Apoſtle might be the clearer: For want of which our Author's Paraphraſe is often obſcurer than the Apoſtle's Text it ſelf.

Verſ. 3. Ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.] That there are a great many things common to the Writer of this Epiſtle with *Philo Alexandrinus*, has been obſerved by the great *Grotius* on *Chap.* iv. and elſewhere. He might have added *theſe* expreſſions which *Philo* alſo has in Lib. *de Creatione Mundi* pag. 25. Ed. Gen. Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τὸν διάνοιαν φύσει λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ΕΚΜΑΓΕΙΟΝ, ἢ ἀπόσπασμα, ἢ ΑΠΑΤΓΑΣΜΑ γέγονεν: *every Man, in reſpect of his Underſtanding, is allied to the Divine Reaſon, being an* IMPRESSED IMAGE, *or abſtract* [i. e. a Particle broken off] *or* BRIGHTNESS [a Ray] *of that bleſſed Nature.* The expreſſions in both places are ſo like one another, that hardly any two can be more like. The word ἀπαύγασμα is the ſame in both places, and ἐκμαγεῖον & χαρακτὴρ are all one in ſenſe. For as χαρακτὴρ is derived from χαράσσειν, *to engrave*, and is properly a *graven Image*: ſo ἐκμαγεῖον comes from ἐκμάσσειν, *to impreſs*, or *expreſs*, and ſignifies ſuch an Image as is made by the impreſſion of a Seal. And hence theſe words are joined together as ſynonimous in the Writer *de Mundo*, who paſſed under the name of *Philo*, pag. 892. Ed. Gen. Ἃ γὰρ εἰσήγαγεν ἐκμὰξαι τῇ ἀιδιότητι, ἅσπερ δακτύλιος τὴν, ἢ σφραγὶς, ἐναπομάξαι τὸ ὁμοιον χαρακτῆρα, ἢ τὸ ἐκμαγεῖον φυλάττῃ περ' ἑαυτῇ: *for whatever*

ever each of the senses submits, like a Ring or Seal, it impresses its own Image, or it [viz. the sense] *retains the impressed Image on it self.* Chapter II. ἐπίγνωσις therefore being the same with χαρακτὴρ, οὐσία & ὑπόστασις will be also the same. And indeed the Son of God, even as Man, is *the brightness of his Fathers Glory*, because he expressed the divine Power in the greatness of his Miracles; and the *impressed Image of his substance*, because he resembles him in his Perfections. And it must be the humane Nature which this sacred Writer spake of, that the *Jews* might understand what he said was true; for that alone is visible, and nothing but what is such, can be called the Image or Brightness of any thing among Men. Other things might be alledged to this purpose, which for brevity sake I forbear to mention.

CHAP. II.

Vers. 3. *Note* b. IF these places, which our Author here wrests, comprehend eternal Salvation, it is needless to recur to that temporal Deliverance, which they cannot be applied to without Violence. For as for his saying that the design of this whole Epistle is to confirm the believing *Hebrews* in the hopes of a sudden deliverance from the persecutions of their Countrymen, if it be denied, he will not prove it, unless by some wrested places, as he too often endeavours to do.

Vers. 7. *Note* c. I. Tho Men in *Psal.* viii. are called בן אדם & אנוש, and those words usually signify *the meanest sort of Men*; yet whoever attentively reads that place, will see that all Men without exception are intended, who upon the account of their meanness are so called; and that they are compared with the Angels, than which they are said to be *a little less*.

II. I cannot see why *Grotius* and our Author interpret βραχύ τι *for a little while*, contrary to the signification which it has in *Psalm* viii. For doubtless *Jesus* was a little less than the Angels, whilst he conversed here on Earth, because he was liable to death, and did actually die; to which Infelicity the Angels are not subject. But this was but for a short time. I grant it, but neither the Psalmist nor the Apostle have any respect to that.

Vers. 10. τελειῶσαι.] This word is not well rendred *to consummate* or *make perfect*, because the Discourse is about a Priest, who is said τελειοῦσθαι, when he *is consecrated* for the exercise of his Office. The *Jews* call this *to fill the hands* (*implere manus*) which the *Septuagint* often render by τελειοῦν. See *Exod.* xxix. 10, 33, 35. *Levit.* viii. 35. &

Chapter III. xvi. 32. & xxi. 10. *Num.* iii. 3. The Gloſſes of *Philoxenus* have: Τελειῶ, *ſaero, to conſecrate.* Chriſt was conſecrated a Prieſt, not by any outward Ceremonies, but thoſe grievous Sufferings which he conſtantly endured. See afterwards *verſ.* 17. and *Chap.* vii. 28.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. THIS obſervation our Author took out of *Grotius*, and is very true. See my Notes on *Gen.* xvi. 1. and *Exod.* i. 21.

Verſ. 11. *Note* c. I. In the time of *Moſes*, *Canaan* was called מנוחה *mnoubhah*, becauſe it was a place in which the *Iſraelites* after ſo many and great Labours were to reſt. *To enter into reſt*, was all one as to enter into a Land where they ſhould be at reſt: Nothing elſe is to be look'd for in that word. See my Note on *Gen.* xlix. 15.

II. *Pſalm* xcv. 11. has nothing prophetical in it, nor is the Diſcourſe ſo much as about *David*'s times. The *Pſalmiſt* only relates what had happen'd in the time of *Moſes*, and endeavours to diſſwade the Men of his Age from imitating the *Iſraelites* of thoſe times, who had provoked God to that degree, that he had ſworn they ſhould not enter into the Land of *Canaan*. This is ſo manifeſt, that I wonder our learned Author ſhould ſtudy for any thing elſe; for what he adds about the Ark, there is no mention of in the *Pſalm*. It is a mere gueſs of our Author, who often adds to the ſacred Writers what he pleaſes, tho the ſeries of the Diſcourſe requires no ſuch thing.

III. As the *Reſt* promiſed to the *Jews* in the Wilderneſs, was the Land of *Canaan*; ſo the *Reſt* promiſed to *Chriſtians* is Heaven, or a place of eternal Happineſs. Nothing can be more natural, nothing more agreable to the Apoſtles Doctrine: on the contrary, what our Author here ſays is forced, and far fetch'd, nor is it needful to confute it all particularly. They are the fancies of a Man looking into the Clouds, and ſeeing what he pleaſes.

IV. Of the *Halcyon* Days, which our Author ſo often repeats, we ſhall ſee what may be ſaid on the place in the *Revelations*, to which he refers us.

CHAP. IV.

Chapter IV. Verſ. 1. Κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ.] That is, into Heaven, of which the Land of *Canaan* was a Repreſentation; not the time when the *Jews* did no longer perſecute the Chriſtians, who nevertheleſs were deſpitefully uſed by the *Heathens*. Our Author here wreſts every thing.

Verſ.

Verſ. 2. Εὐηγγελισμένοι.] That is, we have received a gracious promiſe, as well as they. For if God promiſed to the antient *Jews* a quiet Habitation in the Land of *Canaan*, he hath promiſed us eternal Reſt in Heaven. So that here εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is taken in its proper, that is, in a general ſenſe, for receiving of any good tidings, as it is often uſed in the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, where the Verb in the Original is בשר *biſſer*. Nothing can be more flat than what the generality of Interpreters think the ſacred Writer here ſays concerning Chriſtians, *we have received the Goſpel as well as the antient* Jews; becauſe there can be no compariſon made between the knowledg which the Primitive *Jews* had of the Goſpel, and ours. What our Author ſays in his Paraphraſe, agrees neither with the words, nor the ſeries of the Diſcourſe. Chapter IV.

Ibid. *Note* a. It is much more probable that the true reading is συγκεκραμένον, for the words are theſe: οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος ΤΗΣ ΑΚΟΗΣ ἐκείνους, μὴ συγκεκραμένον τῇ πίστει ΑΚΟΥΣΑΣΙ, *the Word of* HEARING *did not profit them, not being mixed by Faith with thoſe that* HEARD *it*; that is, the words of the Promiſe concerning a quiet Habitation, did not profit thoſe who only heard it without believing it. For they who believe the Word of God are *nouriſhed* by it ſo, as if it were *incorporated* with them, and converted into their ſubſtance; that is, they are no leſs acted and moved by the things which they receive by revelation from God, than thoſe which they have found to be true by reaſoning and experience. And that which makes this *mixture* of the Word of God with the hearers of it, is *Faith*, for which reaſon the ſacred Writer ſaith, λόγον συγκεκραμένον τῇ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ἀκούσασι, *that the Word is mixed by* FAITH *with thoſe that hear it.*

Verſ. 3. Καθὼς εἴρηκεν, ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου.] Tho the words of the xcvth *Pſalm* be here alledged, I do not believe the Sacred Writer uſes the Authority of the *Pſalmiſt* to prove what he deſigns, but only expreſſes an antient Story in his words; which is related in *Num.* xiv. and *Deut.* i. And he interprets *Reſt* in the words of God, expreſſed by *Moſes* and by *David*, in a ſublimer ſenſe, according to the cuſtom of his Age, in which all the places of the Old Teſtament were explained in a more ſublime ſenſe than what the words literally contained. And as thoſe who believed, in the time of *Moſes*, enter'd into the Land of *Canaan*, which then might be called *God's Reſt*: ſo the Souls of pious Chriſtians enter into the manſions of eternal Happineſs, to which that name more eminently belongs. Therefore it is ſaid by the ſacred Writer, *we that believe do enter into Reſt.*

Chapter IV.

Verſ. 5. Εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου.] That is, into *Canaan*, which was as the ſhadow of the heavenly Reſt. I ſay again, there is no mention in the Pſalmiſt of any future *Reſt*; but only the Writer of this Epiſtle deters the Men of his Age from ſinning, by the example of the antient *Jews*.

Verſ. 6. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται, &c.] Theſe words are to be referred and joined to the 2d Verſe in this ſenſe: "Seeing therefore we alſo are to "enter into *Reſt*, underſtood in a higher ſenſe, as I have already "ſaid; when the greateſt part of thoſe to whom reſt in the Land of "*Canaan* was promiſed, fell ſhort of it. That this Verſe is to be joined with *verſ.* 2. may appear by theſe words οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες, which have a reſpect to thoſe other in the 2d *Verſe*, ἡμῖν εὐηγγελισμένοι.

Verſ. 7. Πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν σήμερον ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων, &c.] *Subintellig.* γραφὴ, *the Scripture*, which word is often underſtood in antient Chriſtian Writers. The ſenſe of this place is, that not only the Primitive *Jews* ſhould have taken heed of Unbelief, but all their Poſterity, and conſequently Chriſtians; ſeeing the Scripture teaches that whenever the Voice of God is heard, it is to be obeyed, and Reſt is no leſs promiſed to the Obedient than formerly.

Verſ. 8. Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς κατάπαυσιν Ἰησοῦς.] That is, if no other *Reſt* were to be expected, beſides that which the believing *Jews* of old obtained under the conduct of *Joſhua*, the *Pſalmiſt* would have had no reaſon to admoniſh the Men of his Age and the following Ages, to take heed of imitating the primitive *Iſraelites*, whom Unbelief excluded out of the promiſed *Reſt*, leſt God ſhould puniſh them after the ſame manner. In interpreting theſe words, two things are neceſſary to be done. Firſt, we muſt conſider the ſcope of the Speaker, and by that his words are to be underſtood rather than by the proper meaning of every particular Phraſe. The words Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσε ſignify literally, as they are rendred in the *Vulgar*, *nam ſi eis Jeſus quietem præſtitiſſet*, *For if Jeſus had given them Reſt.* But if they be ſo interpreted, the Apoſtle's reaſoning will be of no force: *If* Joſhua *had conducted thoſe antient* Jews *into a quiet Habitation*; *the Scripture would not ſpeak of another day*, *in which the Voice of God ought to be heard.* Why not? Ought not the Men of the following Ages to be obedient to the Commands of God? Yes. But the meaning of the Sacred Writer in the words alledged is this, which I have expreſſed in the beginning of this Note, εἰ μηδεμία κατάπαυσις ἦν, πλὴν κατάπαυσις, εἰ μὴ κατέπαυσε Ἰησοῦς πλείων ἔδει λέγειν. *Secondly*, ſomething is to be ſupplied in the following words, for otherwiſe what oppoſition could there be between *reſt* and *another day*? If there were no other reſt, beſides that which *Joſhua* gave the antient

ent *Iſraelites*, it would not thence follow there could not be *another day* or another time, in which the Voice of God could not be deſpiſed without danger. But we muſt ſupply here what I have alſo before intimated, ἐν ᾗ ἀπολειπεται καταπαυειν τινας, ἐαν μη ὑπακουσωμεν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτου, *in which we ſhall be excluded out of God's Reſt, if we do not obey his Voice.* Chapter IV.

Yet two things ought to be carefully obſerved in ſuch interpretations and Additions, *Firſt*, no Interpretation is to be admitted, which the deſign of the Speaker clearly underſtood does not require, and to which deſign the Writers reaſoning makes nothing, unleſs it be otherwiſe underſtood than the words properly ſignify. Our Author Dr. *Hammond*, has but little regard to the ſcope of this place, into which he brings his *Gnoſticks* by head and ſhoulders, when the ſcope requires no ſuch thing. I have endeavour'd to make directly towards it, and think I have not much erred from it. *Secondly*, that which is ſupplied, muſt be taken, if I may ſo ſpeak, out of the very bowels of the Diſcourſe, ſo that what is expreſſed do naturally and purely ariſe from propoſitions that muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to be underſtood. And what I have ſupplied ſeems to me to be ſuch, but what Dr. *Hammond* adds, ſeems altogether foreign to this place, of which let the Reader be judg.

Hence we may infer that the ſtile of this Writer is far from being formed by the Laws of Rhetorick; according to which our firſt care ſhould be to ſpeak properly and clearly what we would have clearly underſtood, that the Reader or Hearer may comprehend what we ſay without any pain; and the ſecond to omit nothing but what any one may eaſily ſupply. *Nobis*, ſay the Maſters of that Faculty, *prima ſit virtus perſpicuitas, rectus ordo, non in longum dilata concluſio; nihil neque deſit, neque ſuperfluat. Ita ſermo & doctis probabilis, & planus imperitis erit.* They are the words of *Quintilian* Inſtit. Orat. *Lib.* viii. *Cap.* 2. But the ſtile of the Jewiſh *Midraſchim* is nothing leſs than Rhetorical, and them the Writer of this Epiſtle follows, and not without great reaſon, becauſe he ſpake to a Nation accuſtomed to ſuch a ſtile. This by the way, which it may ſuffice to have ſaid once, tho we muſt carry it in our eye throughout this whole Epiſtle.

Verſ. 9. Ἄρα ἀπολειπεται σαββατισμὸς.] This inference manifeſtly ſhews that the ἄλλην ἡμέραν, *another day*, ſpoken of in the foregoing Verſe, muſt be underſtood of *a day wherein, unleſs we obey the Voice of God, we ſhall fall ſhort of a Reſt which he has promiſed*; and therefore that this muſt neceſſarily be ſupplied. Otherwiſe *there would be more*, as the Logicians ſpeak, *in the Concluſion than in the Premiſes*, which it would be a crime to ſuppoſe of the Sacred Writer.

Verſ.

Chapter IV.

Verſ. 10. Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν, &c.] Here the Author of this Epiſtle renders a reaſon why he called the καπάπαυσιν θεοῦ, by a name taken from the *Sabbath*, viz. σαββατισμὸς: namely, as the day in which God ceaſed to create, or, as *Moſes* ſpeaks, *reſted from his Works*, was called the *Sabbath*; ſo the time wherein we ſhall reſt from all thoſe Labours and Troubles we are forced to undergo in this Life, may be called a *Sabbatiſm*. What our Author here ſays in his Paraphraſe, *of a reſt from Perſecutions*, and a liberty to worſhip God, is violent.

Verſ. 12. Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c.] What is ſaid here by Interpreters about the *Word of God*, is harſh, to which what the Author of this Epiſtle affirms concerning the ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, cannot be applied without violence. Can any Man think this to be a tolerable way of ſpeaking: *the Goſpel is living and powerful, and more piercing than any two edged Sword, reaching even to the dividing of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a diſcerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, nor is there any Creature that is not manifeſt in his ſight?* Yet I can hardly perſwade my ſelf the Diſcourſe is about the *Divine Reaſon*, which is ſo much ſpoken of by *Philo*. But I am apt to think this Phraſe is taken from the Cuſtom of the *Jews* of that Age, who for *God*, and any of the divine Attributes, uſed to ſay *the Word of God* מימרא יהיה, of which Cuſtom there are ſtill frequent inſtances in *Chaldee Paraphraſes* of the Old Teſtament; where in many places we find the *Word of God* ſet for *God*, not for the Meſſias, as ſome think. This conjecture is confirmed by *verſ.* 13. where *all things* are ſaid *to be naked and opened unto his Eyes*, which cannot be ſaid of the Goſpel, but only of God. See about this matter a *Diſſertation de Verbo vel Sermone Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphraſtas Chaldæos*, printed at *Irenopolis*, Ann. M.DC.XLVI. So that the meaning of the Sacred Writer is this, that God who is diſpleaſed with Apoſtates, cannot be deceived, *for God is living*, &c.

Verſ. 13. *Note* c. I do not indeed doubt, but the Metaphor which the Author of this Epiſtle here uſes, is taken from the cutting of the Sacrifices. But 1*ſt*, it is a miſtake, that this was the buſineſs of a μωμοσκόπος, who, among the *Jews*, ſearched only for outward blemiſhes, ſuch as we find mention'd in *Levit.* xx. 22. & *ſeqq.* not for inward defects, which were unknown to thoſe who deliver'd the Sacrifice to the Prieſts. 2*dly*, It is as untrue, which our Author ſays, that the Sacrifice after its being τετραχηλισμένη was laid upon the Altar to be ſearched into; for the Altar of Sacrifices had a continual Fire kept in it; nor was any thing laid upon it, but only the pieces appointed by the Law.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 2. Τοῖς καὶ περικεῖται] It is not to be thought with Dr. *Hammond*, that the Apoſtolical Writer of this Epiſtle ſpeaks here ſo, as if no Sacrifices at all were admitted, but for Sins that proceeded from mere Ignorance; for there were alſo other Sins committed againſt Light and Knowledg that were expiated, and are mentioned by *Moſes* in *Levit. Chap.* vi. 1. to the 7th, where ſee my Notes. But the Sacred Writer ſpeaks in this manner, becauſe the greateſt part of thoſe Sinners, for which Sacrifices were offer'd up, were ἀγνοοῦντες and πλανῶντες.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. I. Our Author tells us in the beginning of this Note, that the word מוראה φόβος *fear*, coming from יראּ *timuit*, is rendred ὐλαβεῖσθαι in *Exod.* iii. 6. but it is the *Root* it ſelf which is uſed in that place. It is ſtrange our learned Author ſhould ſometimes cite places of Scripture upon truſt.

II. The words of *Iſaiah* are in *Chap.* viii. 12, 13. not in *verſ.* 16. and מוראו ſignifies there *that which fears*, to wit, the People of the *Jews* who are there ſpoken of, and not *the terrible thing*, as will appear to any that look into the place. I will not ſay that in the places of *Deuteronomy*, the word מוראּ was ill tranſlated by the *Septuagint*, becauſe they erroneouſly derived it from the Root ראה *raah*, *he ſaw*, which was to be derived from יראּ *jare*, *he feared*. For thoſe places in the *Septuagint* are nothing at all to the purpoſe; and it is true that *fear* may be taken for the cauſe of Fear.

Verſ. 9. *Note* c. It is true what our Author here ſays about the Verb τελειόω, which he might have ſaid before on *Chap.* ii. 10. where ſee my Note. But I think he had better have omitted the Dream of *Menander*, which has no agreement with the thing here ſpoken of, but only in the likeneſs of ſome words.

Verſ. 14. *Note* d. *Solid Food* compared with *Milk*, and fitter for *grown Men* than *Babes*, in that figurative ſenſe which it is here taken in, may be underſtood two ways. It may ſignify either ſomething more excellent, that is, more uſeful than firſt Elements; or ſimply Doctrins hard to be underſtood, and ſuch as cannot be digeſted but by skilful and judicious Perſons. In the firſt ſenſe it cannot here probably be taken; for tho all that is here ſaid be uſeful, yet the Doctrins propoſed as *Principles* and *Foundations*, in the beginning of *Chap.* vi. are much more uſeful than the Allegories we find in *Chap.* vii. & *ſeqq.* For theſe were as ſo many ornaments of the Chriſtian Religion, particularly

Chapter VI.

ticularly among the Jewiſh Allegoriſts; which if we had loſt, we ſhould have miſſed nothing neceſſary. But on the other hand, the Doctrin of Repentance, Faith, the Reſurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment to come, are ſo neceſſary, that being unknown, the Chriſtian Religion is alſo unknown; as on the contrary, being underſtood, nothing neceſſary eſcapes our knowledg. Nay if any one could write of theſe things which belong to the nature of Chriſtianity, wholly omitting Judaiſm, as if there had never been any ſuch thing, in that manner as they deſerve; nothing could poſſibly be deviſed more divine, more excellent, more ſublime. We muſt underſtand therefore by the name of *ſolid Food*, ſome difficult interpretations of the Old Teſtament, which the *Jews* mightily valued, and did not uſe to propoſe, if I may ſo ſpeak, to Novices or freſh Men. Such is that repreſentation of Chriſt, which the Author of this Epiſtle finds in the Hiſtory of *Melchiſedek*. Such is alſo the comparing of the Prieſthood of *Chriſt* with the *Aaronical* Prieſthood. None of theſe could well be propoſed to Men newly initiated, becauſe they ſuppoſed this, *viz.* that the Prieſthood of Chriſt was already very well known. But they are not ſublimer than thoſe things which are taught concerning Chriſt's *Sacrifice*, ſeparately from Judaiſm, or the reſt of the Doctrins peculiar to the Chriſtian Religion: I am ſure, as I ſaid before, they are not ſo uſeful.

Ibid. Τὰ ἀιδιτίεια γεγυμνασμένα.] Theſe words ſeem to be taken from the uſe of the Philoſophers, and eſpecially the Stoicks; who defined ἀμαυτότητα *the avoiding of vain things*, ἕξιν ἀναιρέσεως τῶν φαντασιῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀρθὸν λόγον, *a habit reducing Fancies* or *Viſions to right Reaſon*, as we are told by *Diogenes Laertius* in *Lib.* vii. S. 47. The ſame Men taught τὸς ἀγυμνάστους ἔχοντας τὰς φαντασίας, *that Perſons who had unexerciſed Fancies*, fell into Abſurdity and Vanity.

CHAP. VI.

Verſ. 1. Τελειότητα.] By this word the Apoſtle means, not a more uſeful knowledg than of thoſe things which he preſently after enumerates, but ſome Doctrins which might be added to them, to render Chriſtianity more perfect. So a building has ſeveral things added to it, not neceſſarily belonging to a Building, and without which it cannot ſtand firm; but εἰς τὸν τελειότητα, to make it the more complete, ſuch as are ſeveral kinds of Ornaments. Yet no allegorical Interpretation, of whatever ſort it be, is any wiſe comparable either for its Uſefulneſs or Wiſdom, with the elements of

of Chriſtianity taught by our Saviour in *Mat.* v, vi, & vii. What Dr. *Hammond* adds in his Paraphraſe of this Verſe, about his *Gnoſticks*, he inſerts purely of his own head; the Sacred Writer did not give him the leaſt occaſion for it. Chapter VI.

Verſ. 6. *Note* a. I. I acknowledg Baptiſm is very frequently in the Fathers, called φωτισμὸς, but that uſe of theirs ſeems to be grounded upon this very place, where they thought φωτισθέντας to be all one with βαπτισθέντας; in which, becauſe they might be miſtaken, I do not think the Apoſtle's Language can be underſtood by their uſe. And here I had much rather take φωτισθέντας to be meant of the *enlightning* of the Mind, than the external rite of Baptiſm: See *Grotius* about this word; which, I may alſo here add, is to be underſtood of ſpiritual illumination in the Old *Teſtament*, in the verſion of the *Septuagint*. See *Pſalm* xii. 4. & xviii. 9. & cxix. 129. according to the Greek diſtinction.

II. It is very uncertain whether ever עולם הבא or μέλλων αἰὼν ſignifies *the times of the Meſſias*; and tho thoſe may be called היום אחרים *the latter days*, yet compared with former, they are no where κατ' ἐξοχὴν ſo called. And in this place μέλλων αἰὼν much more probably ſignifies the Life to come, the φαγώματα or *foretaſts* of which Chriſtians have in this, when they are weary of all earthly things, and nothing moves them but the expectation of eternal Happineſs, in which they ſweetly acquieſce. This is indeed *to taſt the powers of the World to come*, when the hope of that only, accompanied with a contempt of all other things, affects and delights our Minds. Of this and the other words conſult *Grotius*.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. The ſignification of the Verb ἀνακαινίζειν muſt be taken from the ſimple καινίζειν, and not from another compound of the ſame Verb. For all that underſtand Greek, know that the compounds of the ſame root have ſometimes very different ſignifications. So that tho ἐγκαινίζειν be *to dedicate*, it does not follow that ἀνακαινίζειν ſignifies the ſame. Beſides, who but Dr. *Hammond* that had accuſtom'd himſelf to a barbarous and intolerable way of ſpeaking, could endure this phraſe *to dedicate to Repentance*? Καινὸς is, as every one knows, *new*, and καινίζω *to make new*, whence ἀνακαινίζω is *to renew* or *to make new again*. They who firſt took upon them the title of Chriſtians, with a ſincere reſolution to live piouſly and vertuouſly, were ſo very much changed from what they were formerly, that they are called *new Men*, and *new Creatures*, by the Apoſtles: See 2 *Cor.* v. 17. *Gal.* vi. 15. *Epheſ.* ii. 15. & iv. 24. Conſequently thoſe who forſaking theſe firſt purpoſes, fell off again to the weak elements of the Jewiſh Religion, or

Chapter VI. to Heatheniſm, muſt, if they would return to Chriſt, πάλιν ἀναπαινίζεσθαι εἰς μετάνοιαν, *be made new again*, or become new Men, *that they might repent*. I alledg the Authority of St. *Paul* for this interpretation, who ſpeaks thus in *Coloſſ.* iii. 10. *Lie not one to another, putting off the old Man, with his Deeds, and putting on the new Man*, TON ANAKAINOYMENON, *which is renewed to knowledg*, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, &c. That *renovation* the ſame Apoſtle calls ἀναπαίνωσιν πνεύ, *Rom.* xii. 12. and πνεύματος, *Tit.* iii. 3. Nor let it be ſaid that the word here uſed is ἀναπαινίζειν, for ἀναπαινίζειν and ἀναπαινῶν ſignify juſt the ſame: See the former in the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, Pſal. cii. 5. & ciii. 31. *Lament.* v. 21. And the *Old Gloſſes* have, Ἀναπαινίζῃ, *innovat*, & ἀναπαίνωσις, *innovatio*. So *Suidas*: Ἀναπαίνωσις, ἡ ἀνάπλωσις· λέγεται ἡ ἀναπαίνωσις· καὶ ἀναπαινῶ. I believe it ſhould be: ἀναπαινόω καὶ ἀναπαινίζω; the repetition of like words was the cauſe why one of them was omitted, and the decay of a Letter corrupted the laſt; which is obſervable in many places of that and other *Lexicons*.

II. This being ſuppoſed the genuin and proper ſignification of the Verb, the ſeries of the Diſcourſe is clear, which otherwiſe is ſomething intricate. The Apoſtolical Writer ſaith, that the *Jews* needed to be inſtructed in that part of the Chriſtian Doctrin, which was propoſed to Proſelytes; which yet he ſays he would not now ſet before them, deferring it to another time; then he ſubjoins the words ἀδύνατον γάρ, &c. as if he had ſaid, "I will not propoſe again that Doctrin, "whereby Proſelytes uſe to be converted to the Chriſtian Faith, that "ſo I may reduce thoſe *Jews* who have apoſtatized from it; for this "they know as well as other things, which I might ſay to that pur- "poſe. By ſuch a Diſcourſe Men who have been once enlightned "with divine Light, who had received the heavenly Gift of a quiet "Mind, who had been endued with a power to work Miracles, who "have had foretaſts in the Church of the promiſed Happineſs of ano- "ther Life, and nevertheleſs have revolted from Chriſt; by ſuch a "Diſcourſe, I ſay, I cannot *renew again* ſuch Men ſo as that they "ſhould repent. But why is it ἀδύνατον ἀναπαινίζειν, *impoſſible to renew again* ſuch Men? *viz.* becauſe whatever could be ſaid or done in order to that end, had been done and ſaid already. They had heard all, and had been ſenſible of all that was naturally apt to fix and engage them for ever to Chriſt. And yet they had not adhered to him, becauſe of Perſecutions. There was nothing more could be done to reduce them to a better Mind, unleſs thoſe things which they already perfectly underſtood, and perceived the efficacy of, were again repeated to them, which would have been to no purpoſe. The ſame

is

is the ſenſe of the following compariſon, and of that which is ſaid about this matter in *Chap.* x. Chapter VI.

III. Now if any one enquire concerning the thing it ſelf, if he throughly conſider it, he will eaſily ſee that it is not without reaſon that the Apoſtolical Writer affirmed it to be ἀδύνατον, that is, if not abſolutely *impoſſible*, as we now ſpeak with the Vulgar Interpreter, yet at leaſt extremely difficult, and the hardeſt thing poſſible. The reaſon I before intimated, becauſe ſuch Men have abuſed all the Reaſons and Arguments which might have inſeparably united them to Chriſt. They are that *Vine of God* for which he had done all that could be done to make them bring forth good Fruit, and yet had brought forth wild Grapes: For which reaſon ſome of the Antients plainly affirmed that it was in vain to expect the Repentance of ſuch Men. As *Hermas* in Lib. iii. Simil. 6. *His non eſt*, ſaith he, *per pœnitentiam regreſſus ad vitam; quoniam quidem adjecerunt ad reliqua peccata ſua, quod nomen Domini nefandis inſectati ſunt verbis; hujuſmodi homines morti ſunt deſtinati. Theſe Perſons cannot return by Repentance to Life; becauſe they have added to the reſt of their Sins, that of blaſpheming the Name of the Lord; ſuch Men as theſe are appointed to Death.* See alſo *Clemens Alexandrinus* in his Book entitl. *Quis dives ſalvetur.*

IV. Μετάνοια is no where in the Holy Scriptures taken for thoſe Church-Penalties which were impoſed upon Penitents before they were admitted again to Communion. Our Author ſhould have produced but one place to make himſelf believed. For it is not ſafe to reaſon about what was done in antient times from the ſtile of the Fathers, becauſe together with new Cuſtoms there were new Names alſo invented, and new ſignifications given to old ones. We have no reaſon to ſuppoſe that the manner of a publick Repentance was the ſame in the Apoſtles times, as afterwards. The Engliſh or German Articles are vainly alledged in this place: But our Author ſhould have cited the viith *Can.* of the *Neocæſarean* Council, in which the phraſe he ſets down is, not the lii, for there are only xv *Canons* in all of that Council. Such another miſtake I have already elſewhere obſerved.

V. Of the *Gnoſticks* here, there is not the leaſt mark or footſtep. The Apoſtolical Writer only makes mention of ſome that had revolted from Chriſt, whether to the *Heathens* or the *Jews*. And ſuch Men joining themſelves to the perſecutors of the Chriſtians, which had formerly crucified Chriſt, did, as much as in them lay, the ſame; becauſe they approved the fact, and deſpitefully uſed Chriſt's Members. This agrees no more to the *Gnoſticks*, than to any Apoſtates.

Chapter VI.

VI. I don't think the Church of *Rome* or others, rejected this Epiſtle, becauſe of this place, as contrary to their Cuſtom; but rather becauſe the Author of it was not certainly known. Nor was it admitted becauſe this Paſſage began to be better underſtood, but becauſe at length the moſt judicious Perſons eaſily obſerved that the ſtile and reaſonings of this Epiſtle were agreeable to the Apoſtles times; in which alſo and no other there could be an Epiſtle written to the Jewiſh Brethren, apart from the *Gentiles*; for in the following Age there was no difference between the Members of the Chriſtian Church, nor any remembrance of Circumciſion and Uncircumciſion. In the antient Church of *Rome*, as appears from *Herma*, there was the ſame opinion about the difficulty of Repentance, in thoſe who after they had been throughly inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion, and been zealous for it, ſhamefully apoſtatized from it. Beſides, that manner of Repentance which was afterwards inſtituted, not having been known in the Primitive times, not to ſay that there is no mention made of it in this place, an Epiſtle could not be rejected as contrary to a Cuſtom which had not yet prevailed.

VII. It is very true that ἀδύνατον often ſignifies what it is not lawful to do, but here it ſeems to ſignify that which is very difficult; for which reaſon a very antient Greek and Latin Copy of the New Teſtament, kept at *Paris* in the Library of St. *Victor*, has in this place, *difficile*, tho the Tranſlation is uſually literal: So ἀδύνατον is taken in *Mat.* xix. 26. I ſhall not add any thing about the *Gnoſticks*, whom our Author here ſeeks for, becauſe I have often confuted him.

Verſ. 7. *Note* c. Our Author here thinks that in this place the ἀπόδοσις & ἀντιπόδοσις of a Similitude are confounded; for which reaſon the Apoſtolical Writer ſpeaks of the Earth, as he would ſpeak of Men. And indeed there ſeems to be ſome ground for this ſuppoſition, if the words μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ be rendred, as uſual, *receiveth a bleſſing from God*. But that mixture of the parts of a Similitude being very improper, I had rather interpret μεταλαμβάνειν ſo, as that the *conſequent* ſhould be expreſſed by the *antecedent*, and that the Verb μεταλαμβάνειν ſhould not ſignify *to receive*, but to *uſe* the bleſſing received from God, that is, Rain, Sunſhine, &c. So the ſenſe will be very proper: *for the Earth which drinketh in the Rain that cometh often upon it, and bringeth forth Herbs meet for them for whom it is dreſſed, uſes the Bleſſing which it receives from God; but that which beareth Thorns and Briers, is reprobate and near a Curſe, whoſe end is to be burnt*; that is, which is of no uſe, except that the Briers and Thorns which grow upon it are burned, or ſerve to make Fires. It is common for the antecedent

cedent to be taken for the conſequent: See *S. Glaſſius* Rhetor. Sacr. *Tract.* 1. c. 1. *de Metonymia Cauſæ.* I might otherwiſe interpret theſe words, *is ſaid to have received a bleſſing from God.* Chapter VI.

Verſ. 20. *Note* e. I. I don't underſtand what our Author means when he ſays that *it was perhaps taken into the Heathen Oracles from* the Prophets, *that about that time among the* Romans *the dignity of the Pontificate was joined with the Imperial.* What Oracles are thoſe? When and where deliver'd? Was there any need of inferring from the Jewiſh Prophets, contrary to all the rules of Logick, that a thing was done at *Rome*, which every one knew? But perhaps he meant to ſpeak of the time to come, tho his words ſignify a thing paſt. However that be, either thoſe Oracles were none at all, or only counterfeited; and our Author dared not, or could not produce them.

II. Even from the time of *Julius Cæſar*, it was decreed, that if he begat a Son, he ſhould be High-Prieſt. Of which ſee *J. Andreas Boſius*, de Pontificatu Max. *Impp. Rom.* cap. 1. who will inform us more exactly in ſuch matters than our Author, who ſpent but little time in ſtudying the Heathen Antiquities, but moſtly imployed himſelf in the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical.

III. He ſhould have added the *Chapter* of the Life of *Auguſtus*, as well as of *Galba* and *Claudius*. But we have no reaſon to be ſorry he did not, for all this ſhould have been blotted out, becauſe the places marked in *Suetonius* are nothing to the purpoſe; which I ſhould have wondred at, if I had not often obſerved a great many more ſuch things in the *Doctor:* The place in *Tacitus* is ſhamefully corrupted. It is taken out of the Oration of *Servius Maluginenſis* Prieſt of *Jupiter*, *Annal.* Lib. iii. c. 58. who deſiring to have the Province of *Aſia* given to him, ſaid this among other things: *Privatis olim ſimultatibus effectum, ut a Pontificibus Maximis* (Flamines Diales) *ire in Provincias prohiberentur; nunc, Deum munere ſummum Pontificum etiam ſummum hominum eſſe, non æmulationi, non odio, non privatis affectionibus obnoxium. Through private grudg it came to paſs in former times, that they* (viz. the Prieſts of *Jupiter*) *were not ſuffer'd by the Chief Prieſts to go into the Provinces; but now by the bounty of the Gods the Chief of the Prieſts was alſo the chief of Men, and not ſubject either to envy, or hatred, or private Paſſion.* The Latins did not ſay *ſummus Pontifex*, and perhaps *Tacitus* would not have uſed the word *ſummus*, but only for the following ἀντίθετον, oppoſition.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 4. Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ.] See *Grotius* on theſe words, and add to the examples which he alledges theſe words of *Horace*, in *Lib.* 1. *Sat.* vi.

——— *Perſuades hoc tibi vere*
Ante poteſtatem Tulli, atque ignobile regnum
Multos ſæpe viros, NULLIS majoribus ortos
Et vixiſſe probos, amplis & honoribus auctos.

Where *nulli majores* are ſuch, whoſe Names and Exploits through length of time are forgotten. And ſuch were the Parents of *Melchiſedek*, for which reaſon he is ſaid to have been *without Father* and *without Mother*, &c. If we conſider this attentively, we ſhall eaſily perceive that before the time of Chriſt no Man could, without a revelation, have imagin'd from the Story of *Melchiſedek*, there would hereafter come an Eternal Prieſt, who was to be Succeſſor to none, nor have any to ſucceed him. Nor could any Man after the Coming of Chriſt, gather by mere reaſoning, grounded upon critical Rules, that *Melchiſedeks* Parents and Death were omitted in the Scripture with this deſign, that by ſuch a ſilence he might be an Image of Chriſt. Whoever ſhould have pretended this, might have been confuted by a bare Negation. Why therefore, you will ſay, did the Apoſtolical Writer inſiſt ſo much upon that Story with the *Jews?* For it's plain he does not ſay here he had any revelation made to him of that matter, nor require credit to be given to his bare Affirmation. I anſwer, the Allegorical Writers of the *Jews* at that time, accommodated innumerable places to the *Meſſias*, not relying upon any Grammatical Interpretation, but a certain old Cuſtom of explaining the Scripture in that manner. So becauſe they interpreted *Pſalm* cx. of the *Meſſias*, the Sacred Writer makes uſe of that Interpretation to his purpoſe; and becauſe they acknowledged the *Meſſias* ought to be *like Melchiſedek*, he reaſons againſt them from their own Conceſſion; not againſt other Men who might have denied what he aſſumed. And he uſed this way of diſputing with the *Jews* ſo much the more willingly, becauſe nothing followed from ſuch an Interpretation contrary to thoſe things which he knew were true concerning Chriſt; yea he might, according to the Jewiſh Cuſtom, compare *Chriſt* to *Melchiſedek*. Otherwiſe, if the thing be conſider'd in it ſelf,

self, no ſtrong or Grammatical Argument could be drawn againſt o- Chapter
thers from that Hiſtory; and therefore ſuch things are not to be too VII.
much urged now, becauſe that way of explaining the Scripture is
grown out of uſe.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. I. The true original of the word ἀκροθίνια is well obſerved by our Author out of *Phavorinus*. It may be further added, that the Fruits gathered out of Fields, and the Spoils taken from Enemies, were piled up in heaps, before the owners of the Fields made uſe of the Fruits, or thoſe who had taken the Spoils divided them; and then from the tops of thoſe heaps, ἐξ ἄκρων τῆς σωρᾶς, before they were diſpoſed of, were taken the Firſt-fruits which were offer'd to the Gods; whence any Firſt-fruits came to be called ἀκροθίνια. I do not deny but the beſt part was conſecrated, but I do not think ἄκρον ſignifies here *the choice*. It is plain ἀκρόδρυα is uſed to ſignify Fruits, not as if *choſen* from Trees, but becauſe they are on the extremities of Boughs, or on the tops of Trees. However I wonder our Author ſhould quote *pag.* 110. of *Phavorinus*, when what he alledges out of him is in *Column* 100. and no where elſe.

II. But I more wonder he ſhould produce only in *Engliſh* the words of *Philo*, out of Lib. 11. *Alleg. Legis*, which are no where to be found in that Book. *Philo* has only this paſſage that can belong to this place, in *pag.* 57. Ed. Genev. Ἄρτος γὰρ καὶ οἶνον προσφέρει, ἅπερ Ἀμμωνῖται καὶ Μωαβῖται τῷ βλάπτειν παρεχεῖν οὐκ ἠθέλησαν· ὃ χάριν ἐκκλησίας ἔφρηται καὶ συλλόγου θεοῦ: *for he offer'd Bread and Wine, which the* Ammonites *and* Moabites *would not give, for which reaſon they are kept out of the Aſſembly and Congregation of God.* Then he enquires, why he gave Wine and not Water, and that he interprets Allegorically.

III. It is ſtrange alſo that our Author, in this pious liberality of *Abraham*, ſhould ſee *a ſufficient Example and Teſtimony of the Cuſtom in* Abraham's *time, of paying Tithes to the Prieſt of ALL our increaſe, of what kind ſoever it is.* For he himſelf has obſerved two things contrary to this Inference: *Firſt*, that *Abraham* gave Tithes only of *the ſpoils of the War*, which is no Evidence that the Antients uſed to pay Tithes when ever their Poſſeſſions were encreaſed; for an *univerſal Propoſition*, as *Logicians* ſpeak, cannot be concluded from *a particular*. *Secondly*, that thoſe Tithes were extraordinary, as being paid to a Prieſt, to whom that tract of Land, wherein *Abraham* dwelt, did not belong; which ſurely cannot be an example of a perpetual Cuſtom of paying Tithes to Prieſts of *the ſame Country*.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. It is very barbarouſly, and without example, that Dr. *Hammond* here joins λαὸν with κατὰ νόμον ſo, as to think that is

a

Chapter VII.

a *periphraſis* of the *Jews*. The reaſon he alledges for this Interpretation is of no moment, becauſe here is not a mere repetition. The ſenſe is: "They have received a Commandment to require Tithes "of their Countrymen, in that manner which is preſcribed by the "Law.

Ver. 11. Τελείωσις.] This word our Author interprets in his Paraphraſe, *of a perfect expiation of Sin*; but he ought to have produced examples of that Notion. *Grotius* thinks it ſignifies *id quod in genere ſacerdotii perfectiſſimum eſt*, *That which is moſt perfect in the kind of Prieſthood*; but that this might be ſaid the thing ſhould have been expreſſed thus, εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις ἐν τῇ Λευϊτικῇ ἱερωσύνῃ ἦν, *if therefore there were perfection in the Levitical Prieſthood*, and not διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης, *by the Levitical Prieſthood*. I believe therefore that here τελείωσις is taken for *Conſecration*, whereby not the Prieſts themſelves, but private Perſons who offer'd Sacrifice, were by the hands of the Prieſts ſo conſecrated to God, as to become acceptable to him. So the Heathens thought themſelves by their Prieſts διὰ θυσιῶν τελεῖσθαι, *to be through Sacrifices initiated and conſecrated* to their Deities, ſo as to be upon that account the more pleaſing to them, as is well known of the *Myſteries of Ceres*. Hence the Chriſtians uſed τελείωσις to ſignify a *Conſecration*, whereby we are rendred more acceptable to God: See *J. Caſp. Suicerus* his *Theſaurus* on this word. In the ſame manner I underſtand the Verb ἐτελείωσεν in *ver.* 19. Of the τελείωσις of Prieſts, ſee on *Chap.* ii. 10.

Verſ. 19. *Note* c. I am apt to think ἐγγίζει has a reference to the myſtical ſignification of the Verb τελεῖν, that is, *to conſecrate*, *to initiate* in certain Rites. For as thoſe that were initiated drew nearer than others to the Images of the Gods, and entred into the ſecret places of their Temples: ſo the conſecrated Prieſts among the *Jews* enter'd into the Sanctuary, which was neareſt that place where God was thought in a ſpecial manner to reſide; and among Chriſtians any one whatſoever, as initiated by the moſt Holy Rites, betakes himſelf to God in Prayer without the intervention of any mortal Prieſt. See Note on *verſ.* 11.

Verſ. 27. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ.] This muſt be referred only to the laſt words ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ λαοῦ, and is not to be underſtood ſo as if Chriſt had offer'd not only for the ſins of the People, but alſo for his own; as *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* underſtood it. For there is no ſuch thing in any other place ſuggeſted by the Apoſtles, and what thoſe learned Men here ſay is violent. Theſe Writers are not to be examined ſo by the Rules of Rhetoricians, as always to be thought to intend what

a

a Rhetorician would have meant by the ſame words. It's true, accurately ſpeaking τάτε ſhould be referred to *the whole verſe*, but the former part of it not agreeing to Chriſt, it muſt be ſuppoſed only to belong to the latter. Chapter VIII.

CHAP. VIII.

Verſ. 1. Ἐν ἀρχῇ τῷ λόγῳ ὁ μεγαλοσύνης.] See my note on *Mark* xvi. 19.

Verſ. 2. Τῆς σκηνῆς ὁ ἀληθινῆς.] That is of *Heaven*, in which Chriſt exerciſed the chief part of his Prieſthood, when he carried into it his blood, as into the moſt holy place. Our Author miſunderſtood this of the Church, in which Chriſt did not execute his Prieſtly Office, but in Heaven. In the words of the Apoſtle, after *the true Tabernacle* we muſt ſupply Θεῦ, *of God*, which is called *true* becauſe God there ſhews himſelf in a peculiar manner preſent, by an inacceſſible light, with which his inhabitation of the Moſaical Tabernacle can no more be compared, than the malignant and as it were *falſe* light of the reflex rays of a Torch, with the true light of the Sun. See what I have ſaid about this phraſe on *John* vi. 55. and about the *Tabernacle of God*, on *Rev.* xxi. 13.

Verſ. 4. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς.] I don't think we ought to ſupply here *only*, after the words *on earth*, with *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*; for the reaſoning of the Apoſtle is not at all cleared by that Supplement. But *to be a Prieſt on earth*, is to be underſtood ſo as if he had ſaid, *by the Moſaical Law*, which appointed only the race of *Aaron* to be Prieſts, *and that to offer up brute Sacrifices in the Temple*, whoſe blood they alone, according to the Law of God, might pour out at the Altar, and carry into the Sanctuary. For Chriſt was of the Tribe of *Judah*, as the Apoſtolical Writer of this Epiſtle elſewhere obſerves.

Verſ. 5. Ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι οἵτινες ἐπουρανίου.] Ὑπόδειγμα and σκιὰ here can by no means ſignify a prefiguration of ſomething future; for Heaven was a great while before the Tabernacle and Temple; but ſome faint and obſcure Image of a thing extraordinary beautiful and glorious. For ὑπόδειγμα is, as painted Images are, *an imitation*, as it is uſed in this very Epiſtle, Chap. iv. 11. *Let us labour to enter into that reſt, leſt any man periſh in the ſame imitation of unbelief*; that is, *in the imitation of the ſame unbelief*; ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδείγματι τῆς ἀπειθείας. It comes from the Verb ὑποδείκνυμι, which *Phavorinus* interprets thus: ὑποδείκνυμι ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπαζωγεῦσαι, ὑποδείξας βίβλους τῷ λόγῳ καθάπερ ὅτι πρὸς γεγραπται: *be re-*

Chapter IX. *presents for he paints*; *I will shew a thing by discourse, as by some picture.* So that ὑποδειγματίζω is sometimes the same with ὑπογράφω, which is, *to delineate*, or *to draw the first and rude lineaments* of things; from whence ὑπογραφὴ is *a rude draught* or *delineation*. And σκιὰ here is the same with σκιαγραφία, that is, a dull or rough Picture, like the representation of a body by its shadow. Then the Phrase *to serve to the delineation and shadowing of heavenly things* signifies to minister to the Sanctuary, which was *a delineation*, &c. as was done by the Jewish Priests. What our Author says here in his Paraphrase, is besides the scope of this place.

Vers. 9. *Note* a. I. What Dr. *Hammond* here says about the mistakes of Transcribers, is very true; as *Lud. Cappellus* in his *Critica Sacra* has shewn: in which Mr. *Pocock* has confuted indeed a few ces, but left the foundations untouch'd; tho he ever now and then has a stroke at them, both in his Notes *ad Portam Mosis*, and elsewhere. Yet they cannot be overturned, because they are undeniably true. But it is true also, before any place be thought to have been differently read by the *Septuagint*, the neighbouring Languages ought to be consulted, which was not always done by *Cappellus*. In this place our Author might have added, that בער and בחל are one and the same root, but differently written; the Letters of the same Organ in the Eastern Languages, and especially the Guttural, being very often confounded.

II. I wonder our learned Author thought the *Septuagint* pointed otherwise the word מלמרה; for *melammedah* is of the Feminine Gender, and cannot be joined with what goes before. The words may be literally render'd thus: *Fuit τὸ timere eorum me præceptum hominum edoctum, their fearing me was a precept taught by men.* If any thing else were to be changed by the Version of the *Septuagint*, we should read מלמרים *melammedim, teaching*. But that is needless, the sense being the same in the Hebrew words as they are now, as it is in the Greek.

III. Our Author mistranslates אשליך by *I have given* or *sent*. He confounds this Verb with שלח *he hath sent*, in his Explication of *Zachar.* xi. 13.

CHAP. IX.

Vers. 1. "Τὸν κοσμικὸν.] The word κοσμικὸν here does not seem to signify an Image of the whole World, as *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* explain it, but rather *earthly*; for κοσμος is often taken both for this lower World and for Men. "Αγιον κοσμικὸν is opposed to ἐπουράνιον. This *Beza* observed, whom the learned

ed Doctor and *Grotius* ſhould have followed in this matter. Chapter IX.

Verſ. 2, Ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια.] *Which is called Holies*, in the plural number, becauſe the moſt holy place was called the *Holies of Holies*, ἅγια ἁγίων, by thoſe that ſpake Greek; for in Hebrew the former is called the *Sanctuary* or *Holineſs*, מקדש *mikdaſch*, or קדש *kodeſch*, never in the plural number; the latter the *Holineſs of Holineſſes* קדש קדשים. By this and what I ſhall obſerve afterwards of the word διαθήκη, it may ſeem probable that the Writer of this Epiſtle was a Grecian, or at leaſt one that did not well underſtand Hebrew, and therefore cannot be thought to have been St. *Paul*.

Verſ. 4. Θυμιατήριον.] *Grotius* underſtands by this word the Golden Cenſer which had fire put into it out of the Altar by the High Prieſt, who afterwards threw *Incenſe* θυμίαμα into it, on the day he entred into the moſt holy place. That Veſſel uſed to be kept in the outward Sanctuary; but *non eſt*, ſaith he, *difficile intellectu, cur dicat hic ſcriptor interius illud tentorium habuiſſe batillum, non quod ibi ſemper eſſet, ſed quod ſemper Arcam, quæ erat in Adyto, reſpiceret*, & in illo *die maxime ſolemni expiationis, in tentorium interius, id eſt, in Adytum tranſferretur. Habere enim dicimur quod eſt in noſtrum uſum. It is eaſy to underſtand why this Writer ſays that inward Tabernacle had the Cenſer, not becauſe it was always there, but becauſe it always had a reſpect to the Ark which was in the moſt holy place, and on* that *moſt ſolemn day of Expiation was carried into the inward Tabernacle, and into the moſt holy place. For we are ſaid to have what is for our uſe.* By the ſame reaſon every thing which was in the outward Sanctuary might be ſaid to have been in the moſt holy place, becauſe *they had a reſpect* to it. It might have been ſaid to *have* the Fire and the Incenſe before they were carried into it, becauſe *they were for its uſe*, and *were to be carried into it*. Which things as they cannot be ſaid, according to the ordinary uſe of Speech, ſo they are by no means agreeable to the Stile of this Writer. For when he ſays, *wherein was the candleſtick, and the table, and the ſhewbread*, that muſt undoubtedly be underſtood properly; and we cannot otherwiſe underſtand what is ſaid here, *which had the golden Cenſer*, &c. I am apt to think therefore, that this was a Jewiſh Tradition of that Age, by which they ſuppoſed that the Cenſer uſed on the day of Expiation was kept in the moſt holy place. See on the following words.

Ibid. *Note* b. It's certain *Iſaac Abarbanel* on 1 *Kin.* viii. 9. ſays there is a Tradition to that purpoſe. See what *Joan. Buxtorfius* has collected about this matter out of the *Rabbins* and other Interpreters, in his *Arca Fœderis*, cap. 5.

Chapter IX.

Verſ. 5. *Note* d. See alſo what I have ſaid on *Rom.* iii. 25.

Verſ. 7. *Note* e. All the Sins that were expiated by Sacrifices, were not involuntary, but only the moſt, as appears from *Levit.* vi. 1. *& ſeqq.* and the greater number gave the denomination.

Verſ. 13. *Note* f. In this place ἁγιάζει does not ſignify *waſhes*, *abluit*, but *luſtrat*, *purifies* or *purges*, that is, according to the Inſtitution of the Law, makes one that was before judged *unclean* with an Uncleanneſs, not properly ſo called, but legal, to be accounted *clean*; tho neither his Mind was made more holy, nor his Body, properly ſpeaking, more clean. For the ſprinkling of Blood and Aſhes rather defiles than waſhes the body. It is a plain caſe. Why therefore did the Apoſtolical Writer ſay, that it *ſanctified the fleſh?* I anſwer, It is all one as if he had ſaid, the Body of ſuch a man was accounted *holy* or *clean*, and might be touched without Pollution: for thoſe that were accounted unclean were thought to pollute every one that touched them.

Verſ. 16. Ὅπου διαθήκη.] Here is as it were a playing with the Ambiguity of the word διαθήκη, which in theſe Writers conſtantly ſignifying ברית, that is, a *Covenant*, was uſed by thoſe that ſpake the beſt Greek for a *Teſtament*. It is true indeed, a Teſtament is ratified by the death of the Teſtator, and Chriſt is dead. But Chriſt was not *the Mediator of a Teſtament*, for Teſtaments do not want Mediators; and if it ſhould be granted that he was, he could not be thought at once a Mediator and a Teſtator, by whoſe death alone a Teſtament was confirmed. The Teſtator here is God the Father, whoſe *heirs* men are, in *conjunction* with Chriſt; but God the Father can in no ſenſe be ſaid to die. See Dr. *Hammond*'s Annot. on the Inſcription of the New Teſtament. So that this Diſcourſe is to be look'd on merely as the play of an *Helleniſtical* Writer, who becauſe he ſaw that διαθήκη was uſed for that Covenant whereof Chriſt is the Mediator, and ſignified alſo a Teſtament, and Chriſt was dead, thence deduced Conſectaries which are true indeed conſider'd in themſelves, but here rely upon weak Principles, rather to ſet off his Diſcourſe, according to the cuſtom of that Age, than to convert the unbelieving Jews to the Chriſtian Faith by force of reaſoning.

They who think every thing ſaid in theſe Writings is mathematically demonſtrative, are greatly miſtaken, and have not read them with due Attention. Nor does this leſſen the Authority of this Epiſtle, the Writer of which no where ſays that he would bring nothing but Demonſtrations. All the Heads of the Chriſtian Doctrine which he proſecutes are very true, and may be demonſtrated by other places

places of Scripture; but the manner in which he illuſtrates them, is plainly like the cuſtom of thoſe times, as we may ſee by *Philo*; in whom there are often ſuch *accommodations*, as Divines ſpeak, of places of Scriptures, and conſequences deduced from them, in which no regard at all is had to Grammar, and the only thing obſerved is, that the thing it ſelf, illuſtrated by them, be true. That was the way of that Age, which we ought no more to wonder at, than at our own preſent Cuſtoms. Chapter X.

Verſ. 18. Οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη, &c. The ſimilitude between the Old Covenant and a Teſtament, which is here urged, is that in both there is a *Death* obſervable, in a Teſtament, of the Teſtator, in the Covenant of a Sacrifice; and that by that Death both are confirmed, tho not in the ſame manner. This is but a ſlight Similitude, from which nothing can be philoſophically inferred: but conſidering the Cuſtom of that Age, an elegant way of reaſoning. I know that *Grotius* would have διαθήκη to be taken in a more general Notion, for an explication of the import of the Teſtator διατιθεμένου his Will. Which is true, where the Hebrew word ברית *brith* is tranſlated, and nothing is added to ſhew there is a reſpect had to a Teſtament properly ſo called; but where there is mention made of *the death of a Teſtator*, the Diſcourſe is about the laſt ſignification of his Will, as in this place.

Verſ. 24. Ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν.] That is, faſhioned according to the τύπος τῶν ἀληθινῶν. The Sanctuary of Heaven is the Pattern, or τύπος, in the likeneſs of which the Tabernacle was made: See my Note on 1 *Cor.* x. 7. But wherein conſiſted that likeneſs? In this, that as God in a ſpecial manner is thought to dwell in Heaven, ſo he dwelt in the Moſaical Sanctuary. This Similitude is certain; what is further added out of *Philo*, or others, are mere Conjectures, and for the moſt part vain λεπτολογίαι, *niceties*.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 1. Τελειῶσαι.] That is, by its τελεταὶ ſo to reconcile and render them acceptable to God, as that they might hope for eternal Happineſs from him. See my Note on *Chap.* vii. 11.

Verſ. 26. *Note* b. I. That it is a defection or falling away from Chriſtianity which is here meant, there can be no doubt; but that we are to underſtand it of a defection to the *Gnoſticks* rather than to the *Heathens* or *Jews*, our Author has not proved: for there is nothing ſaid in this place, which does not exactly agree to thoſe who had revolted

Chapter X. volted to the *Syrians* or *Jews*, after they had known the truth of the Christian Religion.

II. What our Author here adds, about the contempt of the Governors of the Church, I do not see upon what ground it relies; for Men did not ordinarily revolt from the Christian Faith, out of a contempt of the Governors of the Church, but rather of the Gospel it self. They forsook the Assemblies of the Christians, not to shew they despised their Bishops, but to secure their Lives and Possessions for which they had so high a value, that for their sakes they *trod under foot the Son of God, accounted the Blood of the Covenant as a profane thing, and reproached the Spirit of Grace.* Παρακαλεῖν indeed is the Office of Bishops; but private Men also may *exhort* one another, and there is no mention here of the Governors of the Church.

III. What is meant by ἀθετεῖν the Law of *Moses*, I shall afterwards explain. But it is strange that Councils are here appealed to, and such examples brought out of them, to shew what it is *to reproach the Spirit of Grace*; which is to speak contumeliously of the Spirit vouchsafed under the Gospel, to the Apostles.

Vers. 28. Ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωσέως.] The Verb ἀθετεῖν is not simply *to violate*, but by words and deeds to declare a Man will not observe the Law, and does not think it ought to be observed, or scornfully to reject it. And for that wickedness among the *Jews*, there was no Sacrifice of Expiation, as we are told in *Num.* xv. 30. where see my Notes: add also *Deut.* xxvii. 26. & xxix. 19. The Verb ἀθετεῖν signifies *to reject* in *Luke* vii. 30. & x. 16. *John* xii. 48. *Jude* 8. and elsewhere. So the *Old Glosses*: ἀθετῶ *reprobo, to reject*; ἀθετεῖ *refellit, disapproves. Hesychius*: Ἀθετεῖ, ἀτιμάζει, ῥιπτάζεται. Ἀθετεῖται, ὑβρίζεται, καταφρονεῖται.

Vers. 34. Τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου.] Dr. *Hammond* observes in the Margin of the English Translation, that the Alexandrian Copy reads here τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε. So does also the *Vulgar*: *vinctis compassi estis, ye have sympathised with the bound*; which reading is countenanced likewise by the *Syriack* Interpreter. So also it was read in two Copies of *R. Stephanus*. And I doubt not but that is the true reading, which was changed by those who rashly supposed St. *Paul* was the Author of this Epistle.

CHAP.

Verſ. 1. I. IN the place cited out of *Ezekiel*, in the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt, מחאמין muſt not be rendred *auſi ſunt, they took Confidence*, but *impudenter confirmant, they impudently confirm*, viz. *ſermonem ſuum ratum fore, That their word ſhould be made good* or *come to paſs*. The Hebrew Verb ויחלו muſt be rendred *they have made* others *to hope, that the thing ſhould be* accompliſhed. But ſuppoſing this, our Author's conjecture is nevertheleſs good. *Note a.*

II. Ὑποστῆ in the *Septuagints* Verſion of *Mich.* v. 7. muſt not be tranſlated *to ſubſiſt*, but *to hope*. The Hebrew has: *The Remnant of* Jacob *ſhall be among the Nations, and in the midſt of many People, as a dew from the Lord, as ſhowers upon the Graſs; which does not wait for any Man, nor ſtay for the Sons of Men*, where the *Septuagint*, who yet have very ill tranſlated theſe words, have right enough οὐχ ὑποστῆ, that is, *nor waits for the Sons of Men*, or puts Confidence in them. For thoſe Interpreters muſt often be underſtood by the Hebrew words, which they endeavour'd to illuſtrate in their Tranſlation. Now יחל never ſignified *to ſubſiſt*.

III. Our Author in his Paraphraſe interprets the word ἔλεγχος, *a Conviction* or *Perſwaſion*; but he ſhould have brought us an example wherein it appeared that ἔλεγχος ſignified a certain diſpoſition of Mind, and I cannot tell whether any can be found. But till ſuch an inſtance be alledged, I chuſe rather to interpret this word according to its uſual ſignification, that is, *argumentum, an Argument*, as it is rendred in the *Vulgar*. The firm and conſtant *Faith* of wiſe Men, has that weight and influence upon others, as to be an *Argument* for which they believe with them, the reality *of things which they do not ſee*. So St. *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* xv. to prove the certainty of the Reſurrection, to thoſe who had not ſeen it, argues from his own and the reſt of the Apoſtles, and Chriſtians Faith: *Elſe what ſhall they do*, ſaith he, *who are baptized for the dead? If the Dead riſe not at all, why are they then baptized for the Dead? And why ſtand we in jeopardy every hour? —— If after the manner of Men I have fought with Beaſts at* Epheſus, *what advantageth it me, if the Dead riſe not?* &c. Theſe things may be called ἐλέγχῳ οὐ μελλομένων, that is, *arguments* proving the truth of the Reſurrection of the Dead; it being not at all probable that wiſe and good Men would have raſhly, and without reaſon, ſubmitted to ſuch things. The ſame may be ſaid of thoſe examples of Faith, mentioned in this Chapter of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*.

Verſ.

Chapter XI.

Verſ. 4. Πλείονα θυσίαν. Our Author in his Paraphraſe rightly interprets the word πλείονα here *the beſt*, for this Verſe is taken out of the Greek Tranſlation of *Geneſ.* iv. 7. where *Cain* is ſaid *to have offer'd* indeed *rightly, but not to have divided rightly*, that is, to have kept to himſelf what was Gods. See my Notes on that place.

Verſ. 10. Τὴν τὰς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν.] This *Grotius* rightly refers to *Jeruſalem*, which our Author interprets in a myſtical ſenſe, I know not for what reaſon; for if we read *Geneſis*, we ſhall be perfectly of *Grotius* his Mind, nor does the ſeries of the Diſcourſe here require any other interpretation.

Verſ. 16. Κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου.] Theſe words are rightly underſtood by *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* ſo, as if the Apoſtolical Writer had ſaid: Κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, ἢ ἦν ἀντίτυπον ἐκεῖνο, *they deſired a better Country, which was an antitype of Heaven*, that is, the Land of *Canaan*. For it appears from *Gen.* xxiii. 7. & xlvii. 9. that the only meaning of the Patriarchs, in ſaying *they were ſtrangers and ſojourners in the Land*, was that they had no ground of their own in the Land of *Canaan*, but dwelt in it merely by the courteſy of the *Canaanites*.

Verſ. 20. *Note* d. What our Author ſays in this Note is very ingenious, and if not true, ſeems highly probable, as far as the laſt period, beginning with, *and this perhaps*. Becauſe that which follows is plainly forced; for who would ſay that the *Edomites* were *Lords of the Jews*, becauſe when their Commonwealth was overthrown by the *Chaldeans*, they did no longer obey them. Is it all one to be any Mans *Lord*, and *not to ſerve him?* I think not. So that this laſt remark ſhould have been blotted out, or rather not at all written.

Verſ. 21. *Note* e. See my Notes on *Gen.* xlvii. 31. We had better here acknowledg the hand of a Writer who did not underſtand Hebrew, and followed without examination the *Septuagint*, than endeavour to reconcile inconſiſtencies. Our Author commits here another great miſtake, in ſeeking in *Gen.* xlix. for that which is in *Gen.* xlvii. and joining the words of *Chap.* xlix. belonging to another Story, with the words of *Chap.* xlvii. 21. See the places, and you will think it ſtrange that our learned Author, who ſo diligently ſtudied the Scripture, ſhould commit ſuch an error.

Verſ. 29. *Note* f. This alſo is a Dream, plainly contrary to the Hiſtory, and owing to the falſe reaſoning of Interpreters, as I have ſhewn in a Diſſertation *de Maris Idumæi trajectione*, added to my *Commentary* on the *Pentateuch*, Numb. iv.

Ibid. *Note* g. All this is true, but had been obſerved before by *Grotius* and others. See alſo *Davidis Clerici* Quæſt. Sacr. x.

Verſ.

Verſ. 35. *Note* h. I. Mr. *Gataker* has treated largely concerning this word in *Adverſar.* cap. xlvi. who may be conſulted. From the places by him alledged, it ſufficiently appears that τύμπανον, where the Diſcourſe is about an inſtrument of Torment, was properly *a Club*, ſo called from τύπτειν *to beat*; and ſecondarily the place or torment it ſelf of τυμπανισμὸς. From τύμπανον was deduced τυμπανίζειν, that is, to ſtrike with a τύμπανον or *Club*, till the Perſon accuſed made Confeſſion, or elſe died; which Verb was afterwards uſed to ſignify any kind of painful Death. But here where there are particular kinds of Death mention'd, I think it is to be underſtood properly, of thoſe who were beaten to death with Clubs. So that what our Author conjectures of I know not what Engine, that was called τύμπανον, and on which Malefactors were hanged, is vain. Mr. *Gataker* alſo very truly obſerves, that *Lexicographers* often attribute to words thoſe ſignifications, which either precede or accompany the thing ſignified; and that ſhews the reaſon why τυμπανίζεσθαι is ſaid by *Heſychius* and *Suidas* to ſignify to be *flea'd* or *hanged*. Chapter XI.

II. I do not ſee why Κόφων and the *Yoke*, mention'd in *Jerem.* xxviii. 14. ſhould be reckoned the ſame. For from the beginning of the foregoing Chapter it appears that thoſe *Yokes* are conſider'd as repreſentations of *ſlavery*, which the Prophet foretold to ſeveral Nations, not of *Torment* or a Priſon. The only ſimilitude between them, we have any certain knowledg of, is that they were both put upon the Neck.

III. Tho in the νεκυομαντία of *Lucian*, κύφωνες and τροχοὶ are joined together, it does not follow that τροχοὶ is the ſame with τύμπανα; tho *tympanum* ſometimes ſignifies a *Wheel* among Architects. It is ſufficient that the *Wheel* was an inſtrument of Torture, as appears by the Fable of *Ixion*, that in the deſcription of Hell there might be mention made of κύφωνες and τροχοὶ. It is not ſafe to deduce Conſectaries from the order of words. See *Lucian* Tom. i. p. 334. *Ed. Amſtel.*

IV. Ἐπὶ τύμπανον ἐλθεῖν, may very fitly be rendred *to come to the torment of the Club*, or if you pleaſe, to the place in which that Torment was inflicted, becauſe that is *abuſively* called τύμπανον. *Celſus* alſo improperly ſaid τυμπανίζεσθαι for that which is to die a painful Death; nor is it neceſſary he ſhould have thought of a τύμπανον, or of hanging, as we ſhall afterwards ſee, on the place in *Euſebius*, which Dr. *Hammond* laſt of all alledges.

V. The pulling off the Skin, or cutting off the Members, ſignify nothing to a τυμπανισμὸς properly ſo called; nor was it neceſſary that thoſe who ſuffer'd this kind of Torment, ſhould alſo have their Skin pulled

Chapter XI. off, or be dismembred. But all these severities might improperly be called πυκτανισμὸς, in the sense that this word is taken for any sort of Torment.

VI. They who have been a long while beaten with Clubs in all the parts of their Body, may truly be said [as in *Aristotle*] δεινὰ πάντα πεπονθέναι, and ἀνεψυγμένοι εἰς τὸ μέλλον: but it does not follow that πυκτανισμὸς properly so stiled, was a capital Punishment; for there might be a πυκτανισμὸς of fewer or more blows, either for Chastisement, or to Death, as the Judges thought fit, or the Crime deserved.

VII. It is a strange citation of *Eusebius*, which we have here in our Author, after the place in the *Maccabees*. *First*, there is no such thing in *Lib.* iv. of *Eusebius*, but the passage is in *Lib.* ix. c. 40. *Secondly*, it is not taken out of *Polybistor*, but out of *Berosus* himself, or rather out of a fragment of his, which we find in *Josephus*, out of whom *Eusebius* cites it, as appears by the very Inscription of the Chapter. The same fragment has been published by *Jos. Scaliger* out of *Josephus*. So that the comparison the Doctor makes between *Alexander Polybistor* out of *Eusebius*, and *Berosus*, is vain; because one and the same Writer is cited in both places, in whose different Copies, especially in a barbarous name, there might be a various reading.

VIII. The place in *Daniel* is in *Chap.* vii. 11. as was well noted by *Jos. Scaliger* in Not. *ad Fragm.* p. 11. and not in *Chap.* v. But this I should not observe, if the foregoing and following things did not shew that our Author, in collecting this medly, was extreamly careless beyond what he uses to be, and did not think it worth while to look into the places in the Writers themselves. He says afterwards, "*Megasthenes* out of *Abydenus* calls the King of *Babylon* Λαβασσοναγγάρον. On the contrary, *Abydenus* produces the words of *Megasthenes*, in *Eusebius* Lib. xi. c. 41.

IX. I easily believe the punishment of the Club, even to Death, was used among the *Greeks* and *Babylonians*. But our Author's πυκτανισμὸς, as he describes it, was no where used; nor can any thing be alledged in his favour out of *Justin*, who subjoined a synonimous Verb to the Verb ἀνῃρέθη, thinking there was no difference between them; after which manner both he and other Fathers often cite the Scripture. The place is in his *Dialogue* with *Trypho the Jew*, p. 248.

X. Nothing could have been more impertinently alledged by the *Doctor*, to prove that his πυκτανισμὸς was in use among the *Romans*, than the passage of *Eusebius*, or rather of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, out of *Lib.* v. c. 1. of *Eusebius*. For after he had said that the Emperor had written word, that those who professed the Christi-

an

an Religion ought τυμπανιζεσθαι, describing the manner how the President had executed the Emperors orders, he says: ὅσοι μὲ ἐδόκει πολίτας Ρωμαίων ἰσχύειν, τύπτων ἀπέτεμνε τὰς κεφαλάς, τοὺς δ' λοιποὺς ἔπεμπεν εἰς θηρία: *all that were judged to have been made free of the City of* Rome, *he cut off their Heads, and the rest he sent to the wild Beasts.* Where is here our Author's τυμπανισμὸς? *Christophorson* missed him, who had rendred the word *tympanis torqueri*, which is justly censured by *H. Valesius*, with whom yet I should not render *it gladio cædi*, for those who were condemned to be devoured by wild Beasts, ἐτυμπανίζοντο as well as those who were beheaded. Chapter XI.

XI. Not only our Author, but also the great *Grotius* did not know what τυμπανίζεσθαι signified in this place, who on 2 *Maccab.* vi. 19. conjectures that the τύμπανον was *fidiculæ quibus pellis humana ita tendebatur, quomodo bubula in tympano, & qui sic cruciabantur dictos* τυμπανίζεσθαι, *little Cords whereby a Mans skin was stretched so, as the Skin of an Ox on a Drum, and those who were so tormented were said*, &c. But both the reason of the word and use are plainly against him, as will appear to any one that reads *Gataker*, whom I will not transcribe. I shall only add, that in the Old Glosses τύμπανον is rendred *sirimpio*, which is a corrupt Writing for *scipio, a Staff*.

Vers. 37. *Note* i. I wonder our Author here cites Copies which no one else has mention'd. I mistrust they are Conjectures, which he imposes upon us for various Lections. *Beza* affirms that it is so read in all his Copies, and there is no variety of reading observed in the *Oxford Edition*, but of one Copy in which this word is wanting. The same *Beza* conjectures that we might read ἐπυρώθησαν, *they were burnt*; and *Tanaquillus Faber* in *Ep. Crit.* Lib. ii. Ep. 14. ἐπηρώθησαν, *they were maimed* or *dismembred*, which kind of punishment was common among the Eastern People. The Reader may chuse which of these he pleases, either of them being better than the received reading.

Vers. 40. *Note* k. I. If we should admit the reasonings of Dr. *Hammond*, about the signification of the words κρεῖττόν τι, so as to grant they signified tranquillity in this World, and the perpetual duration of the Christian Church; yet we could not allow him, that this may be referred to the times of the Apostles. For what tranquillity did the Christians enjoy for three Ages, greater than the *Jews*, from the beginning of their Commonwealth to this time? It's true, the *Jews* in so many Ages suffer'd various Calamities, but they had also long intervals of Rest and Prosperity, such as the Christians for 300 Years never enjoyed, as the Scripture informs us; as in the reigns of *David* and *Solomon*, and other Kings. Did the Christi-

Chapter XII.

ans enjoy so great tranquillity after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, that there never had been any tranquillity in the Jewish Commonwealth, than which that short rest (if it were any) was not κρεῖττόν τι? But who does not know that the Christians from that time were often grievously persecuted, tho not by the *Jews*, yet by the *Heathens*, till the time of *Constantine*? If therefore we would interpret κρεῖττόν τι of a quiet Profession of the Christian Religion, that were not to be referred, at least principally, to any time, which preceded the Reign of *Constantine*, but to *his* age, and the following ages hitherto; because since that time the Christian Religion has flourished so, that nothing like it was ever seen in the Commonwealth of the *Jews*. See my Note on *Luke* i. 73.

II. The ἐπαγγελία, which the antient *Jews* had not *received*, I chuse rather, with *Grotius* and others, to understand of the resurrection of the Body, and the entire and τέλεια *perfect* Happiness of the whole man; which none had yet enjoyed, except *Enoch* and *Elias*, and perhaps *Moses*, and a few others that were risen with Christ. That Promise is contained in these words, *I am the God of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, as Christ shews. God provided better for us Christians, than to raise them, whose Faith is commended in the Old Testament, from the dead, and make them completely happy, χωρὶς ἡμῶν. So that κρεῖττόν τι περὶ ἡμῶν προβλέψασθαι, is not so much *to provide better things for us*, than for the Jews, as if we were to receive any thing which they are not to receive as to the substance of the thing; but to have a greater regard to us Christians than to the Jews, whom God would not raise from the dead, and make perfectly happy, before the Christians. Those are said τελειοῦσθαι, who are made happy both in Soul and Body, when such whose Souls only are made happy, enjoy but an ἀτελὴς *imperfect* Happiness in comparison with them.

CHAP. XII.

Vers. 1. I. *Note* a. TO understand what the word εὐπερίστατος signifies, it must in the first place be observed that the Verb περίσταμαι very often signifies *circumstare*, *to stand about*, and passively *circumsisti*, *circumveniri*, *to be surrounded*, or *beset*. And hence comes περίστατος, *circa quem statur*, *one who is surrounded*. So *Suidas*; Περίστατοι. Ἰσοκράτης ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀντιδόσεως; Θαυματοποιίαι τινὲς ὑπὲρ ἀφελούσας, ἃς δὲ τῷ ἀνοήτων περιστάτοις γενομέναις ἀντὶ τοῦ περὶ αὐτὰς κύκλῳ ἵστασθαι εἰ διώμοσαι: *Isocrates in his Oration about retribution: Jugling tricks that are of no use,*

use, *but are ſurrounded by a company of Fools; For, which the ſpectators ſtand about in a ring.* This *Harpocration* has, and adds: τὸ ὄνομα ἔχει ἐν τοῖς Ἀγῶσιν ἐπὶ τῶν Εὐτελιζόντων ἐν πλάτει. And on the word ἀθέσμοις he ſays, that in *Dinarchus* ἀθέσμοις πολίταις is all one with περίστατον ματαιοπόνοις. If we add A privative, ἀπερίστατος will be one that no body ſtands about, ſuch as thoſe who have no Friends or Relations, nor any to aſſiſt them in the management of their Affairs. This *Heſychius* had expreſſed, but his words are corrupted: Ἀπερίστατον, μοῦσον, ἀφορμὰς μὴ ἔχον. It ſhould be μόνον, ἀφορμὰς μὴ ἔχον, *alone, not having aſſiſtance or means.* So it muſt be rendred, not as it is by our Author, who tranſlates theſe words abſurdly. In which ſenſe the word ἀπερίστατος is taken in the words of *Georgius Alexandrinus* alledged by our Author; and that Notion ought not to have been confounded with the Rhetorical Notion, which Dr. *Hammond* mentions. Theſe things ſuppoſed, εὐπερίστατος will be properly *one whom others eaſily ſtand about* or *encompaſs*; and becauſe περίστασις ſignifies metaphorically *to be circumvented*, that is, *to be deceived or preſſed with difficulties*, εὐπερίστατος is *one that is eaſily circumvented.* So *Suidas*: Εὐπερίστατον, μωρὸν, πάνυ εὐεξαπάτητον *a fooliſh man who is eaſily turned* or *wound about*, that is, *deceived.* He adds the words of the Apoſtle. So *Heſychius*: εὐπερίστατον, εὔκολον, εὐχερῆ, *eaſy, viz.* to be circumvented and overcome. *Phavorinus* alſo interprets it τῷ εὐκόλως ἐξαπατωμένῳ, *her that is eaſily deceived.* So that in this place, where agoniſtical words are uſed, I am apt to think that εὐπερίστατον ſignifies, *which is eaſily circumvented*, that is, overcome; becauſe all that ran, and ſuffer'd themſelves to be eaſily circumvented, were by that means ſure to be overcom; for they who had circumvented them came firſt to the end of the race. And Sin is called εὐπερίστατον, becauſe thoſe who are infected with it, are eaſily conquer'd, and terrified by difficulties, from perſiſting conſtantly in their Chriſtian Courſe. Chapter XII.

II. It is true indeed that ἀθέσμοις ſignifies ſometimes a caſe wherein a man is in great danger of his life [as in the place cited out of *Diogenes Laertius*] and that among Rhetoricians a ζήτημα or *queſtion* is called εὐπερίστατον which is propoſed without any circumſtances; but all this is nothing to this place, and is a mere medly of undigeſted Learning, or rather of a man groping as it were in the dark, and ſeeking for the ſignification of a word, where it was not to be ſought for. In the place of St. *Chryſoſtom*, εὐπερίστατος is clearly taken in an Active ſenſe, not in a Paſſive: for ἐξαπάτη has an Active ſignification as often as a Paſſive; and that an Active one muſt be aſſigned to it in this place, appears evidently by the following Active Participle καταβάλλων. But St. *Chryſoſtom* is miſtaken; for almoſt all ſuch Nouns have

a

Chapter XII. a Paſſive ſignification, becauſe they are derived from the third perſon of the Preterperfect tenſe Paſſive. So εὐπόριστος, *eaſily paſſable*, εὐπρόσιτος, *well done*, εὐπίτατος, *which is eaſily expanded*, εὐπερίστατος, *which is eaſily ſubverted*, εὐπερίοπτος, *eaſy to be beheld*, εὐαπαίρετος, *which is eaſily taken away*, and innumerable others, which may be found in any *Lexicon*. St. *Chryſoſtom* interpreted this Paſſage in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* by Conjecture, not by Grammatical Rules.

Verſ. 2. Ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ.] That is, on the right ſide of that inacceſſible Light, which is a Symbol of the preſence of the moſt high God. See Note on *Mark* xvi. 19.

Verſ. 3. *Note* b. Κάμνειν is properly *to be tired*, and metaphorically *to faint* or *languiſh*, becauſe when a man is exceſſively tired, his ſtrength fails him. So in the *Apopthegm* of *Coriolanus*, κάμειν is *to have his ſtrength fail him*, or to do that which fainting perſons uſe to do; for when thoſe who ſtood by him beſought him τὸν τὰ κάματα καὶ τὰ τραύματα ἔχοντα καὶ τεθαμβημένον, ἀναχωρεῖν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, *that being burden'd with labours and Wounds, he would retire into the Camp*: Εἰπὼν δ' ὅτι νικῶντων οὐκ ἔξεστι τὰ κάματα, ἐδίωκε τοὺς φεύγοντας: *he ſaying that* it was not the part of Conquerors to be overcome by wearineſs, *purſued them that fled*. Theſe Words are found in *Plutarch* in the Life of *Coriolanus* p. 218. *Ed. Wechel.* T. 1. I cannot tell whether our Author read them in the Writer himſelf, it's certain he ſets down the ſaying of *Coriolanus* otherwiſe than *Plutarch*. However that be, κάμνειν ſignifies, as I ſaid, *to be tired*; ſecondarily to do that which tired perſons uſe to do, as in this place of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*; as to deſiſt from running, to quit the Field, that is, to betake ones ſelf to another Courſe of Life.

Ibid. *Note* c. For *Jerem.* xxxv. we muſt read *Iſai.* xxxv. which place had bin cited by *Grotius* and others.

Verſ. 4. *Note* d. Here our Author confounds σκιαμαχία, that is, a vain fighting with ones own Shadow, with *skirmiſhing*, or ἀκροβολισμός, which are not the ſame among the antient Greeks.

Verſ. 16. *Note* f. That which is here produced out of the *Rabbins* I have ſhewn to be vain on *Gen.* xxv. 31. *Eſau* was certainly *profane* in this, that he deſpiſed the laſt Benediction of his Father, as thinking it to be of leſs value than a Meſs of Pottage.

Verſ. 23. *Note* h. There may alſo be an alluſion here to *Exod.* iv. 22. where *Iſrael* is ſaid to be *God's Firſtborn*, becauſe of the peculiar benefits which God had conferred upon him. For the *Chriſtian Church* ſucceeded in the place of *Iſrael* according to the fleſh.

Ibid.

Ibid. *Note* i. This is a figurative expreſſion, of which I have ſpoken on *Exod.* xxxii. 32. God is repreſented to have as it were a Book, in which he writes down his peculiar Favourites: as Kings have Regiſters of the names of thoſe whom they imploy in their ſervice, or upon whom they confer any benefits. Chapter XII.

Ibid. *Note* k. I eaſily believe this phraſe was taken from the uſe of the *Jews*; but our Author who looks here beſides for I know not what Agoniſtical ſenſe, ought to have produced at leaſt one place, in which πυγμαχησας ſignified *a Conqueror* in the Games; which he could not do. And therefore he ought to have been contented with what he had borrowed from *Grotius*, about the uſe of the *Jews*.

Verſ. 24. *Note* l. 1. Our learned Author would have done much better if he had followed *Grotius*, what he here ſays being either wreſted or affirmed without reaſon. To begin with his laſt words, I will not ſay that the authority of the Writers of Liturgies, whoever they be, is of little moment to the explication of particular places of Scripture; becauſe they had ſcarce any tincture of Critical Learning, as every one knows. But I will ſay that our Author ſuppoſes here two things, which may be called into queſtion. Firſt, that a bloody Sacrifice was offer'd up by *Abel*, which is uncertain, as I have ſhewn on *Gen.* iv. 4. *Secondly*, that all the Sacrifices were *Types*, that is, in the language of our modern Divines, Prefigurations of the Sacrifice of Chriſt; which if denied, can be proved by no Argument: tho I acknowledg there was ſome likeneſs between them, in which ſenſe they might be called *Types* and *Shadows* of the Sacrifice of Chriſt, becauſe of their Similitude, not becauſe of a deſign to prefignify one by the other, which no one knew of. Yet our Author, in his Paraphraſe, attributes his own opinion to the Writer of this Epiſtle, who has nothing at all here about that matter. See my Note on 1 *Cor.* x. 3.

II. The efficacy of *Chriſt's* Sacrifice is not compared here with the efficacy of *Abel's* Sacrifice; but the thing which *Abel* called for (whether by his own, or the Blood of Sacrifices) with the thing which Chriſt demands. And therefore the word is κρειττονα *better things*, which cannot be referred to efficacy, and reſpects nothing but what Chriſt obtained. But it is ſaid, the deſign of this Epiſtle is to ſhew the preheminence of the Goſpel above the Law. I do not deny it, but every particular word does not tend to that deſign; for there are alſo a great many things intermix'd in it foreign to that deſign. So that I had rather with moſt Interpreters, look upon theſe words as an alluſion to what is ſaid of *Abel* in *Chap.* xi. 4. which opinion is manifeſtly confirmed by the Verb λαλειν uſed in both places. For as there *Abel* is ſaid

Chapter XIII. said ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅτι ΑΛΑΕΙΣΘΑΙ, because of his Blood, which in *Gen.* iv. 10. is said to *have cried unto God from the Earth:* So here the Blood of Christ κρείττονα ΑΛΑΕΙΝ than *Abel*, or than the Blood of *Abel*.

Verſ. 25. Τὸν ὁδὶ τῆς γῆς —— χρηματίζοντα, —— ἢ ὁ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν.] I. The ὁ ὁδὶ τῆς γῆς χρηματίζων is undoubtedly a Periphraſis of *Moſes*, but he is not to be thought to have ſpoken from Mount *Sinai*, when he ἐχρημάτιζε, *gave Oracles*, from which he himſelf ſaid nothing; but in the *Camp*, when he heard the Reſponſes of God from the Sanctuary, which he afterwards declared to the People.

II. The ὁ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν does not ſeem to be *Chriſt*, who for the moſt part taught the Goſpel upon *Earth*; tho ſometimes alſo, but rarely, he revealed himſelf to the Apoſtles from Heaven after his Reſurrection. I rather think it is to be underſtood, with *Grotius*, of thoſe Voices which came from Heaven on the behalf of Chriſt, mention'd in *Mat.* iii. 17. & xvii. 5. and elſewhere.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. DEſ. *Eraſmus* and *Nicol. Zegerus* had gone before our Author in this Interpretation, but *Beza* objects againſt it the following words: πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς, where if that interpretation be allowed, δὲ muſt be taken for γὰρ, in this manner: *Let Marriage be honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, for Fornicators and Adulterers God will judg.* I am of opinion the Antients read γὰρ for δὲ, as it is in a Greek and Latin Copy, and in the *Vulgar* Tranſlation which has *enim*; and that this was changed into δὲ by thoſe who did not think theſe words were an Exhortation.

Verſ. 9. *Note* d. When our Author made this collection, he does not ſeem to have looked into *Acts* xv. 40. where *to be commended* or *deliver'd to the Grace of God*, is without doubt to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Goodneſs. Beſides, the words which he produces as following, are in *Acts* xiv. 26. But he ſeems to have fallen into a miſtake, becauſe there is alſo the ſame expreſſion in this latter place of the *Acts*, immediately preceding them: *And thence ſailed to* Antioch, *from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the Work which they fulfilled.* But here παραδίδοσθαι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ, is not to be ſent to preach the Goſpel, but to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Grace; tho this had been done, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* might preach the Goſpel with ſucceſs.

Verſ. 10. Ἐξ ἧς φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες.] He alludes to the Sacrifices offer'd up on the day of Expiation, as every one ſees.

But

But to make the ſeries of the Diſcourſe clear, he ſhould have expreſſed what is here to be underſtood, and upon which that which follows depends. Chriſt is an expiatory Sacrifice, which we muſt eat, that we may have an intereſt in the efficacy of it, as we are taught by Chriſt in *John* vi. 50. and *ſeqq.* But by the Moſaical Rites, no Man taſted of ſuch a Sacrifice, ſo that they who deſire to be dealt with by God according to that Law, cannot partake of the Expiation made by Chriſt. This is the reaſoning of the Writer of this Epiſtle, of which he has only expreſſed the two laſt Propoſitions, by which omiſſion the ſeries of the Diſcourſe is made obſcure. But it will be ſaid perhaps, that there is an ambiguity in this reaſoning in the word φαγῶν, becauſe the Chriſtians did no more eat of the Fleſh of Chriſt, properly ſpeaking, than the *Jews* of the expiatory Sacrifices. I acknowledg there is that ambiguity, but the Sacred Writer did not urge this Argument as a demonſtration. It is a reaſoning which properly proves nothing againſt Men of other Sentiments, but illuſtrates only the Chriſtian Doctrin after the Jewiſh manner; of which kind there are a great many in this Epiſtle, as I have already elſewhere obſerved. That which follows in this place, is of the ſame kind. Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 11. Ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων, &c.] Our Author in his Paraphraſe ſays that *the* Jews *themſelves acknowledged* that the expiatory Sacrifices *typified* or prefigured the *Meſſias*. I wiſh he had produced a paſſage out of ſome Antient *Jew*, in which that was affirmed; for no one will believe him ſaying this raſhly. For my part I cannot perſwade my ſelf that the *Jews* had any ſuch Thoughts; whoſe greateſt Argument againſt Jeſus his being the *Meſſias*, was his Death; and the Goſpels ſufficiently ſhew they imagin'd no ſuch thing of the *Meſſias*.

Verſ. 15. *Note* e. I. It being undeniable by all learned Men, that the *Septuagint* very often read the Hebrew otherwiſe in their Copy, than we do now in ours, what need is there with Mr. *Pocock*, of inventing forced interpretations, rather than acknowledg what is eaſy and plain? There is much more probability in their opinion, who think the *Septuagint* read (with a difference in the diviſion of the Letters) פרי משפתינו, *fruit out of our Lips*, or blotting out מ *the fruit of our Lips*. Nor muſt it be thought, that becauſe καρπωσις and καρπωμα are derived from the root καρπὸς, therefore thoſe words may be confounded. For καρπωσις & καρπωμα are immediately deduced from καρπόω, which is properly to be *gathered*, and is applied to *Fruits*; then, becauſe Fruits after they are gathered are conſumed, it ſignifies *to conſume*, by which ſignification we are to explain the two former words, as al-

Chapter XIII. so their Compounds ὁλοκάρπωσις & ὁλοκάρπωμα, which are often in the Verſion of the *Septuagint* uſed for whole Burnt-offerings. The ſame Interpreters render the Verb אבל *to eat* καρπῶσθαι in *Joſ.* v. 12. So alſo they render the Verb בער *to burn* in *Deut.* xxvi. 12. So that κάρπωσις & κάρπωμα may ſignify a whole Burnt-offering, tho the word καρπὸς do not occur in that ſignification; becauſe that word is not deduced from καρπῶσθαι, as the two former are.

II. The Rabbinical reaſon, why ſome Holocauſts ſhould be called קיץ *ſummer Fruit*, I do not value a ruſh, becauſe it is not certain that it is an antient Phraſe. For that giving of thanks is here called καρπὸς, ſignifies nothing to the name of Holocauſts, which elſewhere are always called by other names. Beſides, it is utterly falſe that Holocauſts, which were the chief and daily Sacrifices, never to be omitted, as appears from *Num.* xxviii. could be look'd upon as a Banquet over and above the preſcribed Feaſt. In fine, who will believe that in this one place of *Hoſ.* xiv. 2. καρπὸς is uſed for an Holocauſt, which is conſtantly called κάρπωσις and κάρπωμα, or by other names; and that this happen'd accidentally in a place where we may reaſonably ſuppoſe the *Septuagint* read the Hebrew word פרי *phri*, which properly ſignifies Fruit? They who can believe ſuch things, after due examination, muſt either have ſpoiled their judgment with a continual reading of *Arabick* or *Rabbinical* Trifles, as ſome have done; or elſe be naturally dull.

III. And therefore our Author, not willing to rely upon Mr. *Pococks* conjecture, turns himſelf to other things; but 1*ſt*, he is certainly miſtaken in thinking the *Septuagint* uſed the ſingle word καρπὸς, only becauſe it yielded the ſame ſenſe with κάρπωμα, as ſufficiently appears by what I have already ſaid: 2*dly*, he is miſtaken in thinking that זבח תודה is Praiſe expreſſed with the Mouth. It was a kind of Sacrifice, in which a Victim was offered no leſs than in others. 3*dly*, It is a miſtake that the *Septuagint* have thrice rendred the word אשם ſo as he ſays; for that word is twice only found in *Levit.* vii. 1, 2. Beſides, our learned Author was deceived by a falſe diſtinction of the Chapters in the Verſion of the *Septuagint*, which do not anſwer the Hebrew in the *Polyglot* Bibles. The Verſion of the three firſt Verſes of *Chap.* vii. of *Leviticus*, in the Hebrew, is in that Edition of the *Septuagint*, *Chap.* vi. 31, 32, 33. where אשם is rendred rightly περὶ τῆς πλημμελείας. That which is in the ſame Edition in *Chap.* vii. 1, 2, 3. anſwers to *verſ.* 11, 12, 13, of *Chap.* vii. in the Hebrew, and we do not there find the word אשם *aſcham*, but the words שלמים and תודה *ſalutaria* & *celebratio*, *which bring Salvation*, and *celebrating*. The *Septuagint* have no where rendred אשם by σωτήριον.

IV. The

IV. The Offerings joined with the celebration of the *Euchariſt* are without doubt pious, and the practice of the Chriſtian Church in that particular, both heretofore and now, very commendable; but I do not think there is any reference here had to thoſe Oblations, which cannot but very harſhly, and if I may ſo ſpeak, ἀμμωδικῶς, *in the dialect of Dr. Hammond*, be called *the fruit of the lips*. But in the following Verſe there is mention made of Liberality. What then? Can't that be a new Precept? By all this it appears to how little purpoſe Dr. *Hammond*'s Collection is in this place.

ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
General Epiſtle of St. *James* the Apoſtle.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] I. I am apt to think the title of Ἀπόστολος was not added to the name of *James*, in the Apoſtolical times; wherein no one was called an Apoſtle ſimply and without any addition, beſides Apoſtles properly ſo ſtiled, that is, men called by Chriſt himſelf; as appears by the conſtant uſe of St. *Paul*. The uſe of following Ages I do not regard, nor the judgment of *Theodoret*, which is confirmed by no antient Example. So that I think this Inſcription to be of a later date than the Age of the Apoſtles.

II. It is much more probable that St. *James* was killed in the Year of *Chriſt* LX. as *Ant. Pagus* on that year has ſhewn, *in Epicriſi Baroniana*.

III. The paſſages in this Epiſtle, which our Author underſtands of the *Gnoſticks* and the deſtruction of the *Jews*, are as fitly interpreted by others, of any bad men whatſoever, or any other Judgments of God. Of which matter, it will be more proper to ſpeak on thoſe paſſages themſelves.

CHAP. I.

Verſ. 3. Δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν.] This is generally interpreted, *the trying of your faith*, as if it were τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν; but it is harſh to tranſpoſe the Pronoun ὑμῶν; and without any Tranſpoſition theſe words will have the ſame ſenſe, if they be rendred thus: *the tryal of you worketh patience of faith*, that is patience proceeding from faith, as ὑπακοὴ πίστεως is *obedience proceeding from faith*. Yet there is a like tranſpoſition obſervable in 1 *Pet.* i. 7. in this very Phraſe, unleſs perhaps in both places for ὑμῶν τῆς we ought to read ὑμετέρης.

Verſ. 6. *Note* a. I have a ſuſpicion that Dr. *Hammond*, when he firſt ſet about the explication of the New Teſtament, began with the explanation of this Epiſtle, becauſe his ſtile is harſher and more intricate than ordinary, which yet is every where very much neglected; and becauſe beſides there are a great many things here violently and by ſtraining deduced from the words of St. *James*. In his Paraphraſe he repreſents him ſpeaking what he pleaſes, becauſe he departs far from his words, and in his Annotations he wreſts them with forced conjectures.

I. It is falſe that in *verſ.* 9. the diſcourſe is about ſufferings; and tho that ſhould be granted, it would not follow that the four antecedent Verſes belong to the ſame matter, becauſe in this Epiſtle there are divers Precepts often ſet one after another without any order or connexion, as well as in other Apoſtolical Epiſtles. Theſe holy men ſpake thoſe things which they thought would be uſeful to thoſe whom they wrote to, without obſerving any method, which is not neceſſary in ſuch Writings and Admonitions.

II. If the Apoſtle had intended to ſay what our Author would have him, he would have expreſſed his mind thus; αἰτείτω ἐν πίστει ὤν, and not ſaid ſimply αἰτείτω ἐν πίστει, which is, *let him ask with faith*; that is, believing that God can and will do good to us, and grant us every thing that is neceſſary; or not doubting concerning the divine Promiſes. This is properly that Faith which is to be joined with our Prayers.

Verſ. 8. Ἀνὴρ δίψυχος.] That is, doubting concerning the divine Promiſes. *Clemens*, in *Epiſt.* 1. to the *Corinthians*, cap. xi. ſays, that *Lot*'s Wife diſagreeing with her Husband, was changed into a Statue of Salt, εἰς τὸ γνωστὸν εἶναι πᾶσιν. ὅτι οἱ δίψυχοι καὶ οἱ ἀμφιζοῆσις περὶ τῆς Θεοῦ δυνάμεως εἰς κρῖμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται: *that all might know, that double-minded perſons, and ſuch as doubt concerning God's Power,*

are

are for a condemnation and ſign to all generations. The ſame *Clemens* uſes the Verb διψυχεῖν in the ſame ſenſe with διακρίνειν, cap. 23. Μὴ διψυχῶμεν, μηδὲ ἐνδιαλλάσσω ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ὅτι πολὺς ὑπερβαλλόντως καὶ ἐνδόξοις δωρεαῖς αὐτοῦ. Πόῤῥω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὐτὴ, ὅτε λέγει· ταλαίπωροι εἰσιν οἱ διψυχοῦντες τῇ ψυχῇ, &c. *Let us not be double minded, and let not our Soul beſitate about his excellent and noble Gifts. Far be from us that Scripture where it is ſaid: Miſerable are the double minded, they that are of a doubtful Heart,* &c. The ſame Verb is uſed by *Barnabas* cap. xix. in the way of Light: Οὐ μὴ διψυχήσῃς πότερον ἔσται, ἢ οὔ: *do not doubt whether it ſhall come to paſs, or not.* Heſychius: Διψυχία, ἀπορία, *doubting.* In the ſame ſenſe we more than once meet with the word *dubius* in *Herma's Paſtor.* See *Lib.* iii. Simil. ix. §. 21. Chapter I.

Verſ. 9. *Note* b. I. Tho *joy* and *boaſting* are uſually joined together, yet thoſe words ought not to be confounded, as if they had the ſame ſignification, which really differ; becauſe there may be joy without boaſting, and this place manifeſtly requires the notion of *boaſting* properly ſo called; which is oppoſed to ταπείνωσις, *humiliation*, and is joined with ὕψος *height.* For if we may mix things which have an affinity with one another, we ſhall make ſtrange confuſion; and here the elegancy of St. *James* his ſaying will be all loſt. *Let the Brother that is low boaſt in his height*; that is, that he is a Chriſtian, than which nothing can be more honourable, if we rightly conſider the thing: but on the other hand rich Men, whoſe confidence in their Riches generally makes them proud, ought ἐντρέπεσθαι καὶ αἰσχύνεσθαι ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτῶν, *to bluſh and be aſhamed in their humility*, that is, becauſe of their low and baſe diſpoſition, in putting confidence in earthly and fading things. There is a double *Antitheſis* here obſervable; for firſt the ὕψος of the poor Man is oppoſed to the ταπείνωσις of the rich, and ſecondly the καύχησις of the former to the αἰσχύνη of the latter. For tho there be no Verb joined with ἐν ταπεινώσει, the manner of the oppoſition ſhews that ſome ſuch thing muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, as *Grotius* and other Interpreters have well obſerved. And nothing can be better oppoſed to *boaſting* than ſhame: So that we muſt ſupply, with *Oecumenius*, αἰσχύνεσθω. To this ſenſe which neceſſarily ariſes from the very words of St. *James*, our Author's Paraphraſe makes nothing; in which he expreſſes his own forced conceptions, and not the mind of St. *James.*

II. What is here ſaid of the diſpoſitions of poor and rich Men, has not any ſpecial relation to perſecution for the ſake of Religion, but may be ſaid of them at any time. For as poor Men ought always, to keep themſelves from being caſt down, to think how honourable a Condition

Chapter I. tion it is to be a true Christian, and to *boast in the Lord*; so rich Men, if they are conscious to themselves of putting confidence in their Riches, ought at all times to be ashamed of the vileness of such a disposition.

III. But the particle δὲ, if Dr. *Hammond* may be judg, shews these words must be connected with what goes before. But δὲ here is put for μὲν, because there follows another δὲ, and the words are to be rendred thus: *Let the Brother* indeed *that is low, boast in his height*; but *let the rich Man be ashamed in his being low.* We meet with a great many examples in the best Writers, where when δὲ occurs twice, the first is taken for μὲν, as the manner of the opposition shews. See *Henr. Stephanus.*

Vers. 11. *Note* c. If there were any thing here to be alter'd, I should chuse to read ἐν ὑπαρξεσι, *in* his *Riches*, that is, together with his Riches.

Verses 16, 17. Μὴ πλανᾶσθε, &c.] Our Author in his Paraphrase obtrudes his *Gnosticks* here upon us, of whom there is not the least mention or footstep in St. *James*. So Men see in the Clouds what they please.

Vers. 21. Ἐν πραΰτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον.] Here again our learned Author forces his *Gnosticks* upon us, as if there were none that could be charged with ῥυπαρία and περισσεία κακίας, but the *Gnosticks*. St. *James* alludes to Circumcision, in which the filthy and superfluous Skin was cast away, not to any peculiar practices of the *Gnosticks*. Ὁ ἔμφυτος λόγος is a word which is ingrafted in the Minds of its Hearers, that is, takes as it were root in them, if they *receive* it *with Meekness*, that is, with a teachable Mind. This word is used also, in the same sense, by *Barnabas* Epist. cap. ix. Οἶδεν ὁ τὴν ἔμφυτον, δωρεὰν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ δόντος ἐν ἡμῖν: *he knows, who has put into us the ingrafted Gift of his Doctrin.* Where the old Interpreter mistranslates the word ἔμφυτον by *naturale*, which he has also in the beginning of that Epistle, where the Greek is wanting.

Vers. 23. *Note* e. Without doubt the former interpretation is the more probable, if not also true. But I had rather,

I. Understand σχῆμα γνήσιον of *a natural Countenance*, not as it is opposed to a *Vizard* or *Mask*, but as opposed to a painted face. For Maskers do not use to behold their *Vizards* in a Glass, but their *Faces*. I might shew that Dancers, and other effeminate Men, corrupted the natural colour of their Countenances with Paint; but ἀνὴρ seems to be taken here for ἄνθρωπος *homo*, as it is often in Poets, so as to comprehend also Women.

II. I do not think St. *James* ſpeaks as well of that which is *uſually* done, as of that which *might* be done. For he compares them who having heard the Word, retain the Vices which the Word condemns, with thoſe who ſeeing the ſtains of their countenance in a Glaſs, ſhould not waſh them off; which being accounted a piece of Madneſs and Abſurdity, they muſt alſo neceſſarily be accounted Fools and Madmen, who when they obſerve their Vices repreſented and condemned in the Doctrin of the Goſpel, do not think of forſaking them. The former is very ſeldom done, the latter too frequently; becauſe Men take more care of their Bodies, than of their Souls. They are offended with the ſpots of their Face, but they are not offended with the blemiſhes of their Minds. Chapter II.

Verſ. 27. *Note* f. This might all be admitted, if it were certain that none but the *Gnoſticks* thought Religion to conſiſt rather in Faith than in Practice. Bnt who told Dr. *Hammond* that, among thoſe who lived in the *Apoſtolical Churches*, there were none who *turned the Grace of God into laſciviouſneſs?*

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I Do not think there is a reſpect here had to the *Shechinah*, for *the Glory of Chriſt* ſignifies rather in this place his Kingdom, as Dr. *Hammond* himſelf ſeems to have obſerved. So that I take the meaning of this Verſe to be this: "Ye who "believe that Chriſt reigneth in Glory, ought not to have reſpect to "Perſons; becauſe he promiſed to make the Poor, as well as the Rich, "provided they believed and obeyed him, partakers of his Kingdom. See *verſ.* 5.

Verſ. 2. *Note* b. I. To begin with this laſt remark, our learned Author ought to have told us where we might find the Jewiſh *Canon* he ſpeaks of, and alledged the words of it themſelves; but I am apt to think he had it only from the Mouth of ſome *Jew*, or learned Man that affirmed he had read it in the writings of the *Rabbins*. Where are the Chriſtians, who having Controverſies with *Jews*, and thoſe of mean Condition, think fit to refer them to the judgment of a *Chacham?* Namely in the Kingdom of *Utopia*. Yet there is, I confeſs, a *Jewiſh* Canon to this purpoſe, tho not ſuch as our Author ſpeaks of, ſet down by *J. Henr. Hottinger*, out of *R. Levi Barcinonenſis*, in *Leg.* cxlii. *Juris Hebraici: Let not one ſit down, and the other ſtand; but let them both ſtand, becauſe when they are before the Council, it is fit they ſhould ſtand as if they were in the preſence of the divine Majeſty* ——— *Yet the* Rabbins *ſay that*

Chapter II. *that if* [the Council] *will permit the contending parties to ſit down, they may, which words muſt be underſtood of the time during which the Cauſe is examined; but whilſt Sentence is pronounced, they are obliged to ſtand* ——— *But becauſe it became the Cuſtom in all the Conſiſtories of the* Iſraelites, *that after the deciſion they were commanded to ſit down, to avoid contention, tho they were only Witneſſes, they command them now alſo to ſit down. Hottinger* ſets down the Hebrew words, and refers the Reader to other places in the *Rabbins*.

II. I don't think that κατέδυναστεύων in *verſ.* 6. ſignifies the ſeats of Chriſtian Judges, or places in which they aſſembled; for a rich Man drawing a poor Chriſtian before Chriſtian Judges, could not be ſaid καταδυναστεύειν *to oppreſs him*, becauſe it belonged to the Judges to reſtrain the rich Man's Anger. Beſides, it is a miſtake that κριτήριον in 1 *Cor.* vi. 4. ſignifies a Tribunal, as I have ſhewn on that place.

III. What our Author alledges, does by no means prove that συναγωγαὶ ſignifies Conſiſtories of Chriſtian Judges. For *firſt* none were Judges properly ſo called, but *Roman* Magiſtrates, or thoſe of privileged Cities. *Secondly*, reſpect of Perſons may have place not only in publick Judgments, but in any other; as when we entertain poor Men with ſcorn, whatever Gifts and Vertues they are endued with; and treat the rich with all kind of reſpect, becauſe they are rich. *Thirdly*, if we ſuppoſe that the Controverſies which aroſe between Chriſtians, according to the advice of St. *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* vi. were decided by Chriſtian Judges; we muſt not dream here of Tribunals and Foot-ſtools ſet for thoſe Judges. Theſe were the appurtenances of Magiſtrates, not of private Men; unleſs perhaps it ſhould be thought that Biſhops, in that Age, pronounced ſentence from ſome high place, like Magiſtrates; which none, I ſuppoſe, who underſtand theſe matters will ſay in good earneſt. *Fourthly*, we become κριταὶ or *Judges* of the dignity of Men, when we aſſign them Seats, as we think their Dignity requires; and when we have only a regard to Riches in this matter, then we imitate corrupt Judges. So that any may be called κριταὶ, who do ſomething like them. *Fifthly*, κριτήρια, as I have ſaid, did not belong to Chriſtian Judges, but to Heathens; and therefore that word does not prove that the diſcourſe is here about Judges. *Laſtly*, a variety of Seats does not belong ſo much to an aſſembly of Judges, as to a Congregation of many private Men, ſuch as Eccleſiaſtical Meetings.

IV. So that it is much better to underſtand theſe words, with *Grotius* and other Interpreters, of a Church Aſſembly, in which St. *James* not

not without reaſon complains that the poorer ſort were treated with too much contempt, and the rich with too much honour; for in thoſe Aſſemblies at that time, when there were no Magiſtrates, who, upon the account of their Office, juſtly have the moſt honourable Seats allotted to them, it was abſurd to have a regard merely to Riches. Thoſe who ſat there, were eſtimated by nothing but the name of Chriſtians, and were admitted into thoſe Aſſemblies becauſe they were Chriſtians, and not becauſe they were Rich. And therefore no difference ſhould have been made between Men as to the place of their ſitting, barely upon the account of their poſſeſſions. Chapter II.

Verſ. 4. *Note* c. I. To begin ὑστερον πρότερον, *preposterously*, our learned Author is miſtaken, when he ſays that the Verb διακρίνεσθαι is in the *middle* voice, which dropt from him before he was aware; for any Child knows that διακρίθητε is the firſt Aorilt paſſive.

II. Και ου might eaſily be a Hebraiſm for ου interrogative, or *whether or no*, becauſe in that Language the Particle *And* often abounds. It is plain, it is prefixed to interrogations in *Mat.* xviii. 21. and *Acts* xxiii. 3. from which it might be abſent, without any prejudice to the ſenſe. But I had rather in this place blot out και, with the *Alexandrian* Copy, to which we may join perhaps the *Vulgar* Interpreter: Κι here ſeems to have been added by ſome Tranſcriber, who did not ſufficiently underſtand the ſeries of the Diſcourſe.

III. Nothing could have been invented more harſh, than that the ἀπόδοσις of the period ſhould begin in *verſ.* 5. *If ye have a reſpect*, &c. ——*hear, my beloved Brethren, hath not God choſen?* &c. Beſides, our Author without neceſſity faſtens a Soleciſm upon St. *James*; for after five Verbs in the Subjunctive Mood had gone before, which are govern'd by the conditional Particle ἐὰν, he ſuppoſes that διακριθητε and γένησθε are ſubjoined in the ſame conſtruction. *If any one come in*, εισελθη, *having a gold Ring*; *and there come in alſo*, εισελθη δε, *a poor Man*; *and ye have reſpect*, επιβλεψητε, *to him that weareth the gay clothing, and ſay* εἴπητε *to the poor, Stand thou there*; which words, according to Dr. *Hammond*'s opinion, would be followed by theſe, and ye *have not doubted in your ſelves, and are become judges*, &c. But to avoid a Soleciſm, St. *James* ſhould have ſaid διακριθητε, and γένησθε, in the Subjunctive Mood, whereas we have here two Indicatives, which I wonder our Author could join with the foregoing in the Subjunctive.

IV. Διακρίνεσθαι, tho in the Paſſive voice, ſeems to be taken in an Active ſenſe, as innumerable other Paſſives, in Greek Authors. So in *Herodian* Lib. iv. c. 6. Οἱ στρατιῶται τῷ βιάζεσθαί τι καὶ ἀρπάζειν λαβόντες ἐξουσίαν οὐκέτι διακρίνουσι τίνες ἦσαν οἱ στασιάσαντες φυγεῖν ἐμέλλησαν: *the Souldiers having*

Chapter III.

ving obtained permiſſion to exerciſe Violence and Rapine, did no longer diſtinguiſh who they were that had ſpoken inſolently. Accordingly the Apoſtle's meaning is this; *do not ye put a diſtinction within your ſelves*, between a rich and a poor Man, merely for the ſake of Riches, with which one abounds, and the other is deſtitute? In a Church conſiſting of Chriſtians, which at that time were all private Perſons, there ought to have been an equality in ſeats, not a difference made according to Mens Eſtates; as if it had been the buſineſs of the Governors of Churches to take an account of Peoples Poſſeſſions, and according to their ſeveral Eſtates, to diſtribute them into ſeveral Claſſes. The thing it ſelf requiring this ſenſe, there is no need of ſeeking any other.

Verſ. 24. Ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.] That is, no one is look'd upon by God as a good Man, merely becauſe he believes the Chriſtian Religion to be true; but beſides that, its Precepts muſt be obeyed, that we may be accounted good Men, and become acceptable to God. St. *James* here oppoſes thoſe who did not join a vertuous Life with the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. And St. *Paul* in his *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, oppoſed the *Jews* who pretended that Men might become good and pleaſing in the ſight of God, by the mere obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*; and ſhews that thoſe who believe in God, and live piouſly, might be accounted juſt, and be in favour with God, without the performance of legal Works. See my Notes on *Rom.* iii. and iv.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. THE interpretation of *Grotius* ſeems to me to be much more natural, according to which St. *James* here forbids every one indifferently to aſpire to the Office of a Teacher; becauſe a ſeverer account will be required of him that undertakes to teach others, and would have himſelf believed by the more ignorant, than if he were content to be wiſe for himſelf, or err alone, without endeavouring to make Proſelytes of others. Μεῖζον κρῖμα λαμβάνειν is not *to have a greater Judg*, but to *receive the greater Judgment*, that is, the greater Condemnation if we offend. So λαμβάνειν περισσότερον κρῖμα is taken in *Mat.* xxiii. 14. *Luke* xx. 47. *Mark* xii. 40. ſee alſo *Rom.* xiii. 2. It concerns indeed every one to bridle their Tongue, leſt they ſhould condemn any raſhly, but eſpecially thoſe who teach others; becauſe their Judgments are moſt valued, and have the worſt conſequences attending them, if they are unjuſt. This makes both Pages in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and a more wholeſom Precept than this could

not

not have been given to Christians, which I wish they had suffer'd to sink down into their Minds! But there neither was of old, nor is at this day any thing more common than the rash judgments of διδάσκαλοι *masters.* Chapter III.

II. That long and nice Comparison of this place with others, in which either the same thing is not spoken of, or at least the Discourse is no more about the *Gnosticks* than the *Jews*, too much addicted to Judaism, or about other Men no better than they; that nice Comparison, I say, of those places does not prove that St. *James* here has a respect to the *Gnosticks.* Nay, I do not think, here and elsewhere, where the Apostles address themselves to Christians, living under Christian Bishops in Apostolical Churches, that Schismaticks are referred to. See *vers.* 10. & 13.

Vers. 5. *Note* b. Οὕτω is certainly the beginning of an ὑπόδοσις here, and the Particle ἰδὲ of the σύστασις. The sense is: As Horses are governed by a small Bridle, and a Ship by a small Stern, so the Tongue which is a little member, rules whole Societies. I do not see why we should depart from the natural signification of the particle οὕτω. But it is no wonder that our learned Author, whose stile is full of intricacies and windings, should make a difficulty where there was none.

Vers. 6. *Note* c. Our Author here follows *Grotius.* But the *Syriack* Interpreter seems rather to have rendred the place, corrupted, as he thought it should be understood, than as he read it, because all the Copies contradict him. Besides, he rendred it otherwise than the *Doctor* says, for he has: *and the Tongue is a Fire, and a world of Iniquity is like a Wood. Grotius* had not carefully enough look'd into that Interpreter, and Dr. *Hammond* rashly followed him. When I read this place, I can hardly forbear thinking that a Gloss out of the Margin crept into the Context; and if it be cast out, both a useless repetition will be avoided, and the series of the Discourse very proper thus: Ἰδὲ ὀλίγον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει; καὶ ὕτως ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως: *behold how great a matter a little Fire kindleth; and so the Tongue is among our Members, which defileth the whole Body, setting on Fire the wheel of our Generation* (genituræ nostræ.) As there is nothing wanting in this sentence, so there is nothing superfluous. *First*, the word ὕτως shews that thence we must begin the ὑπόδοσις of the comparison, as in the foregoing Similitudes; in which the σύστασις is begun with the Particle ἰδὲ, and the ὑπόδοσις with the Conjunction ὕτως, as it is here. *Secondly*, the words which signify the same thing, and have no coherence with one another,

Chapter III. ther, being unneceſſarily interpoſed between the parts of the Similitude, are caſt out; for ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ ſignifies the ſame with the whole Similitude, and κόσμος ἀδικίας plainly ſpoils the connexion of the Diſcourſe.

But how ſhould theſe words come to be written in the Margin? *to wit*, in this manner. Some body had expreſſed the ſubſtance of the whole Similitude in theſe two words ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, and added them to the Margin of his Copy; as many do, who to find out any thing the more eaſily, ſet down by way of Abridgment the ſubject ſpoken of in ſuch or ſuch a place, in the Margin of their Books. Then as an interpretation of ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, he had added ὁ κόσμος, *the World*, namely, *is meant*; and had ſubjoined ὁ ἀδικίας, to explain the word ὁ τροχὸς, underſtanding the *wheel of Generation* to ſignify *the wheel of Iniquity*; that is, a wicked and unregenerate Life, or ſuch as the Life of Men *born*, but not born again. And theſe things having, not without ſome reaſon, been ſet down in the Margin, were raſhly inſerted into the Context.

Ibid. καθίσταται.] This word I render *is*, according to its uſual ſignification, in good Authors. What a ſpark of Fire is, put among combuſtible matter, that the Tongue is among our Members.

Ibid. *Note* d. I have obſerved on *Mat.* i. 1. that the word γένεσις does not ſignify every event, and I muſt not repeat here what I have there ſaid. I had rather underſtand by τροχὸν γενέσεως, *the Wheel*, or Chariot *of Life*, ſo called, becauſe at our *Nativity* we enter into that Charlot, and with reſtleſs *Wheels* run haſtily, till we come to the Grave.

Τροχὸς ἅρματος γὰρ οἷα,	*For like the Wheel of a Chariot*
Βίοτος τρέχει κυλιδνὶς.	*Life runs rolling.*

They are the words of *Anacreon* Od. iii. on himſelf.

Verſ. 17. *Note* f. I. I have ſhewn on *Chap.* ii. 4. that our learned Author is miſtaken, in the ſignification he attributes to the Verb διαχίζομαι. But tho what he there ſays were true, it would not follow that the word διδιάκεττος ought to have a ſignification deduced from the middle Voice, becauſe it comes from the third Perſon of the Preter-perfect tenſe Paſſive διακέχεται, as every one knows.

II. But becauſe the Paſſive conjugation of this Verb is taken both in a Paſſive and Active ſenſe, διδιάκεττος may be taken alſo in either of theſe ſenſes, according as the thing ſpoken of requires. Thus *Heſychius* firſt interprets διδιάκεττον, μὴ ἔχοντα διάκειον, *which has no difference*, or

or makes no difference, in an active Notion. And then ἀδιάκετος (not ἀδιάκοτος as it is commonly read) ἀδιαχώετος, *undistinguished*, in a Passive signification, as it is expounded also in the *Old Glosses*. So *Suidas*: Ἀδιάκετος, ἀδιαχώετος· λαμβάνεται ἢ καὶ ὅτι ἢ μὴ γινωσκόντων τὰ Κοντα, ἢ ἀφείτως φλυαρούντων: *it is taken also for those who do not know what they ought to do, or that talk triflingly and foolishly.* Here it is taken in an Active sense, but in a good one, for him that does good to all without distinction. For that other signification put upon it by Dr. *Hammond* is without example, and has no foundation in any antient Grammarian. Chapter IV.

Vers. 18. *Note* g. I do not think there is here any ἀνταναλλαγὴ, for it is a Greek phrase which may be expressed in Latin thus: *Qui faciunt pacem illi serunt in pace fructus justitiæ, those that make Peace sow in Peace the fruits of Righteousness*; that is, they who promote Peace or Christian Concord, whilst they follow after Peace, sow as it were that Righteousness, the fruit of which they shall hereafter reap. For *to sow the fruit of Righteousness*, is all one as to do righteous Works, which shall be rewarded in their proper time. But St. *James* express'd himself somewhat harshly, when he said *to sow Fruit* for that which is ordinarily called *sowing Seed*, whence a Plant or Tree is produced, which afterwards brings forth Fruit. But he could not say *to sow Fruit*, that is, a Reward, without speaking very improperly.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 5. *Note* a. HOW forced what our Author here says after other Interpreters is, every one sees. I had rather say here what is sufficiently evident from several places of the New Testament, and of two very antient Writers, *Barnabas* and *Clemens*, that in those times the *Jews* used to produce, as out of Scripture, not only the sense of places without regarding the words, but also a Jewish Tradition, or interpretation of places of Scripture. So that I should no more look for what is here said, in the Old Testament, than what is alledged in *Heb.* xii. 21. as spoken by *Moses* of himself, *I exceedingly fear and quake*, or what is said in *Barnabas* of the Scape Goat *cap.* vi. or in *Clemens* cap. xvii.

Vers. 6. *Note* b. It was a long while since Dr. *Hammond* had read *Virgil*, when he alledged his words in such a manner. He describes the Manners of the *Romans*, and not the part of Kings, *Æneid.* Lib. vi. l. 851. & *seqq.*

Tu regere Imperio populos Romane memento,
Hæ tibi erunt artes, paciſque imponere morem,
Parcere ſubjectis & debellare ſuperbos.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 3. *Note* a. IF this Epiſtle had been written to the *Jews*, who lived in *Paleſtine*, Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretation might be admitted; but what he ſays here does not agree to thoſe of that Nation that were diſperſed through the Roman Empire, for all the *Jews* every where were not killed by *Veſpaſian*. Thoſe only who lived in *Paleſtine*, and the neighbouring Countries, and had riſen up in Arms againſt the *Romans*, were deſtroyed by them. So that I rather think St. *James* here ſpeaks of that day, which is much more truly called *the laſt*, and that his admonition is more general.

Verſ. 7. *Note* b. Seeing the *Jews*, who in *Italy*, or in *Greece*, and other Provinces remote from *Judæa*, had embraced the Goſpel, received no harm by the ſtanding of *Jeruſalem*, and the Jewiſh Commonwealth, nor any benefit by their Deſtruction; I do not ſee why they ſhould be commanded to wait for this with patience. And therefore I rather think what the Apoſtle here ſays is to be underſtood of the laſt Judgment, which he ſpeaks of as near at hand, becauſe it was unknown when it was to be, and therefore every Age ought to look upon it as nigh. And it's certain as to particular Perſons, Chriſt may truly be ſaid to come, when he calls them by Death to Judgment.

Verſ. 9. *Note* c. Seeing St. *James* does not ſpeak here to the *Jews* who had embraced the Chriſtian Faith in *Paleſtine*, but thoſe who were ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ *ſcattered abroad*; I am apt to think he does not ſo much reſpect here the Vices of the Jewiſh Zealots, as of thoſe *Jews* who lived in other places; which yet I do not deny to have followed the Example of the Zealots in *Paleſtine*.

Verſ. 15. *Note* g. It is much better to underſtand here after ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, *his Sins by the Lord*; that the Phraſe may be entire thus: κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ἁμαρτίας ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου: *if he has committed Sins, his Sins ſhall be forgiven him by the Lord:* There is no mention here of Eccleſiaſtical Puniſhments, but only of the miraculous curing of a Diſeaſe, and obtaining pardon from God, not from the Prieſt. So that what our Author here ſays about the Abſolution of the Church, is foreign to this place. Whoever ſeriouſly endeavours to reform his paſt Life, and to make continual progreſs in Holineſs, does not need the forgiveneſs of a Prieſt; on which Chriſt has no where

where taught that the Hope or Salvation of a Christian depends. And whoever does not amend his sinful practices, would in vain receive all the Absolutions and Benedictions of all the Priests in the World. Chapter V.

Vers. 16. *Note* h. Notwithstanding what our Author says, the word ἀλλήλους shews the Discourse to be about a mutual confession of Faults between equals, or those who are reckon'd equals. *That* is the perpetual use of the Greek Language without any exception, as to the word ἄλληλοι; nor does the place alledged out of 1 *Pet.* v. 5. prove the contrary, as I shall there shew. It is ridiculous to say that the Prayers of an Elder praying *ex officio*, are more effectual, than the Prayers of any good Man whatsoever that fears God; as if God granted the thing requested of him, for a Mans Office, and not for his Piety. And there is the same absurdity in saying that a Priest particularly laying open the Sins of his Brother to God, is the more likely by that means to prevail with him; as if God did not know what a Sinner stands in need of, or had promised more to such Prayers than to general ones. And little better is that which is added about *direction*, as if it were certain that Elders use to give better or more faithful advice in this matter, than any other pious and learned Men; when experience teaches us that they have no more discretion than others, and often use Religion only as a means to enrich themselves, or encrease their Authority.

ANNO-

Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the first Epistle General

Of St. *Peter* the Apostle.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] I. I will not deny that St. *Peter* wrote this his first Epistle in that Year which *Baronius* affirms, for there is nothing said in it from which any certain judgment can be made of the time wherein it was written. But that St. *Peter* was then at *Rome*, is a mere invention of those who thought the falshoods of the *Clementine Homilies* to be a true History. He seems not to have gone thither before the reign of *Nero*, as Dr. *Pearson* acknowledges in chap. viii. Diss. 1. *concerning the Succession of the Roman Bishops.* We may consult also about this matter *Lud. Cappellus* in *Append. Historiæ Apostolicæ*, and *Ant. Pagus* in *Baron. Epicr.* on the years of Christ xliii. *num.* 2 & 3. and liv. *num.* 3. Yet I had rather say that this Epistle was written later, after St. *Paul* had preached the Gospel round about *Asia*; for before that time there do not seem to have been so many Christian Churches, to which St. *Peter* might write.

II. That by the name of *Babylon* we are not to understand *Rome*, but a City properly called by that name, is granted by Dr. *Pearson*, who also shews that the *Chaldæan Babylon* was at that time desolate, and so that it is the *Egyptian Babylon* that is here meant. Those who desire to be fully satisfied in this matter, may consult Dr. *Pearson* himself.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 2. Εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμόν.] Seeing there is a change here made in the form of the expression, and after these words ΕΝ ἁγιασμῷ τοῦ πνεύματος by *sanctification of the Spirit*, the Apostle immediately subjoins ΕΙΣ ὑπακοὴν *unto obedience*, I am apt to think the difference of these Propositions must be observed, so as that this should be the sense; elect by Sanctification of the Spirit, that they might

might perform obedience, and that they might be ſprinkled with the Blood of Chriſt. They are ſaid here to be *elected*, who are ſeparated from the reſt of Mankind, not by ſome unknown Decree, but by the Spirit of Sanctification, whereby their Lives are amended, that they may become the People of God. Chapter I.

In the mean time I wonder here at Dr. *Hammond*, who compares ὑπακοὴν and ῥαντισμὸν with one another, as if they were both joined with αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and were taken in a Paſſive ſenſe. For ὑπακοὴ, when the Diſcourſe is about one that obeys, is always taken Actively, and cannot here be taken otherwiſe. Beſides, ὑπακοὴ is not joined with αἵματος, but ſtands alone; but ῥαντισμὸς is connected with αἵματος, and is taken in a Paſſive ſenſe, for we do not ſprinkle the Blood of Chriſt, but are our ſelves ſprinkled with it. The thing is clear, and no one here could have ſtumbled, but our Author; who in theſe Annotations on the General Epiſtles, has ſurpaſſed himſelf in barbarouſneſs of ſtile.

Verſ. 4. Εἰς ὑμᾶς.] In this place I ſhall remark what is elſewhere often obſervable in theſe Writings, *viz.* that the Apoſtles frequently begin a ſenſe without continuing it, and no otherwiſe connect their Diſcourſe, than with the laſt words of the former Period, and the beginning of the next; ſo as on occaſion of the laſt word to begin a new ſenſe. For the better underſtanding of which, I have ſubjoined ſome of St. *Peter*'s words, in which thoſe are printed in Capital Letters, which connect the Diſcourſe.

Verſ. 4. *To an Inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reſerved in Heaven for* YOU; 5. WHO *are kept by the power of God through Faith unto Salvation, ready to be revealed in the laſt* TIME: 6. WHEREIN *ye greatly rejoice, tho now for a ſeaſon (if need be) ye are in heavineſs through manifold* TEMPTATIONS: 7. *That the* TRIAL *of your Faith being much more precious than of Gold that periſheth, tho it be tried with Fire, might be found unto Praiſe, and Honour, and Glory, at the appearing of* JESUS CHRIST; 8. WHOM *having not ſeen, ye love;* —— 9. *Receiving the end of your Faith, even the* SALVATION OF YOUR SOULS; 10. *Of* WHICH SALVATION *the Prophets have enquired and ſearched diligently.*

Verſ. 5. Σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.] Here St. *Peter* ſpeaks only of *eternal* Salvation, as the foregoing words manifeſtly ſhew: See *ver.* 4. Nor was there any Salvation *revealed* to the Chriſtian *Jews*, ſcatter'd through *Aſia Minor*, by the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. Our Author ſpeaks every where as if *Proconſuls* and *Pretors* had been ſent from *Jeruſalem*, not from *Rome*, into the Provinces of the

Chapter I. *Roman* Empire, who had perſecuted the Chriſtians. But certainly the Chriſtians had reaſon to fear only the Heathen Magiſtrates, not a few contemptible *Jews*, to whom no part of the Adminiſtration of the Provinces belonged.

Verſ. 10. Σωτηρίας.] That is, *of the Salvation of Souls*, of which he ſpake in the Verſe before; or of eternal Happineſs, which will then only be conferred, when Chriſt returns from Heaven. Of *this* Salvation the Prophets enquired; not of a deliverance of the Chriſtians from the fear of the *Jews*, whom they had no reaſon to be much afraid of, unleſs perhaps in *Judæa*. Yet ſome may object in favour of Dr. *Hammond*, the following Verſe, in which the Diſcourſe is principally about things that happen'd in the time of the Apoſtles, whence he inferred that σωτηρία ſignified a Deliverance which happened in the ſame Age. But the learned *Doctor* did not obſerve, that the Prophets, who deſired to know the time of the laſt Judgment, did at once covet to know when were to be *the ſufferings for the ſake of Chriſt*, becauſe after them, and not before, Chriſt was to come to Judgment. And hence St. *Peter* calls all thoſe things which had already followed, and were afterwards to follow, τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας, that is, *the glorious things that after them ſhould come to paſs*; not immediately and all together, but at ſeveral intervals, which not only the Apoſtles, but alſo the Angels themſelves were ignorant of.

Verſ. 11. Τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα.] This *Beza* renders, *eventuras Chriſti perpeſſiones*, *The future Sufferings of Chriſt*, which *Grotius* follows, and ſays that ἀποβησόμενα is underſtood, and ſo εἰς ὑμᾶς is taken in the foregoing Verſe. But εἰς ὑμᾶς does not ſignify *your*, but *to you*: *who propheſied of the Grace* εἰς ὑμᾶς *to you*, that is, to be conferred on you; or which God was about to beſtow on you. So alſo in *ver.* 4. *Salvation reſerved in Heaven* εἰς ὑμᾶς, is either *until you*, or for your ſakes. And agreeably, τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα muſt ſignify the ſufferings of good Men for the ſake of Chriſt; which the Prophets obſcurely foreſaw, and the Glory of Believers that ſhould follow; but of which they knew not the times, only it was revealed to them that they were not to come to paſs in their Age. This excellently agrees with the ſeries of St. *Peter*'s Diſcourſe, who ſpeaks of the Afflictions which Chriſtians endured for Religion ſake.

Verſ. 12. Εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν Ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.] This I underſtand of the time of the laſt Judgment, which the Angels do not know. Otherwiſe, if St. *Peter* had ſpoken of a thing already paſt, he would have ſaid ἐπεθύμησαν, *deſired*.

Verſ.

Verſ. 20. Προεγνωσμένου.] That is, whom God had purpoſed in himſelf, before the Creation of the World, to ſend at this time. The Apoſtle does not ſay προεπαγγελμένου *preſignified*, which makes me wonder why Dr. *Hammond* here ſpeaks of *Types* and *Images*. At this rate, the Apoſtles may be made to ſay any thing. Chapter II.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. Ἀποθέμενοι, &c.] *Grotius* rightly obſerves that St. *Peter* here means thoſe Vices which had been very common among the *Jews*, and with which thoſe to whom he writes had been infected. But our Author, without reaſon, would have the Vices of the *Gnoſticks* to be intended; which yet at that time, wherein he ſuppoſes this Epiſtle was written, could hardly have infected ſo many. Beſides, the Verb ἀποτίθεσθαι *to lay aſide*, ſhews that the Diſcourſe here is about Vices, with which thoſe to whom St. *Peter* writes, had been corrupted, in Judaiſm it ſelf; and not about unknown Vices, againſt which they were only to fortify themſelves.

Verſ. 4. Λίθον ζῶντα.] By a Metaphor taken from Plants, which ſtick yet faſt to their Roots, and are nouriſhed by juice aſcending from them, Stones which remain ſtill in the Quarry are ſaid to be *living*. By which Epithet here, I ſuppoſe, is meant the firmneſs of that thing which is ſignified by the name of *a Stone*; becauſe nothing is firmer than Stones, ſtill growing in a Quarry, or cleaving faſt to a Rock by their Roots. For which reaſon a ſteddy and inflexible purpoſe of Mind is compared by *Ovid* to ſuch a Stone, in *Metam.* xiv. where he ſpeaks of *Anaxaretes*:

Durior & ferro, quod Noricus excoquit ignis,
Et ſaxo quod adhuc VIVUM *radice tenetur.*

Hermas in his *Viſion of the Tower*, thus deſcribes Chriſt, *Lib.* iii. Sim. 9. §. 2. *In medio campo candidam & ingentem mihi petram oſtendit, quæ de ipſo campo ſurrexerat*; *In the midſt of the Field, he ſhewed me a white and huge Rock, which had riſen out of the Field it ſelf.*

Verſ. 12. *Note* f. I. In St. *Peter*'s words there is an *Ellipſis*, common in all the beſt Greek Writers, who expreſſing only the Relative Pronoun, leave the Demonſtrative to be underſtood. Thus therefore we muſt Grammatically explain this Phraſe, where the Pronoun to be ſupplied is expreſſed in great Letters: Ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν, ὡς κακοποιῶν, ΤΟΥΤΟ ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ὑμῶν ἐποπτεύοντες, δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεὸν:

Chapter II. *that wherein they ſpeak againſt you, as evil doers, underſtanding* THIS *more throughly, by your good Works, they may glorify God.* In the ſame manner we muſt reſolve the Phraſe, occurring about the ſame matter in *Chap.* iii. 16. Ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν, ὡς κακοποιῶν, ΕΝ ΤΟΥΤΩ, καταισχυνθῶσιν ἐπηρεάζοντες: *that wherein they ſpeak evil of you, as of evil doers,* IN THIS *they may be aſhamed, that falſely accuſe your good Converſation in Chriſt.*

II. It is true that ἐποπτεύειν ſignifies more than ὁρᾶν, to ſee, for it is properly *to look into*, or *underſtand throughly*; for this Verb is immediately derived from ἐπόπτης, which ſignifies a Judg or Witneſs of the more ſecret Rites uſed in Holy Myſteries; the ſight of which not only the profane Multitude, but alſo the *Myſtæ* themſelves were debarred; which we may learn as from others, ſo eſpecially from *J. Meurſius* in his *Eleuſinia Sacra*. I ſhall produce but one Teſtimony out of *Suidas*: Ἔποπται, οἱ τὰ μυστήρια παραλαμβάνοντες· λέγονται ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν μύσται, μετὰ ἐνιαυτὸν δὲ ἔποπται καὶ ἔφορι: *were thoſe who took part of the Myſteries; they were called at firſt* Myſtæ, *and the next Year* Epoptæ *and* Ephori. Afterwards it follows: Ἐποπτεύειν, διαφέρει μύστης καὶ ἐπόπτης, in which words he ſeems to intimate that there is the ſame difference between ἐποπτεύειν and *to know*, viz. ſuperficially or externally, as between an *Epopta* and *Myſta*. The ſame Author hath: ἐπόπτεια, ἐπίσκεψις, *conſideration*. Therefore I believe we ought to correct the *Old Gloſſes*, in which ἐποπτεύω is rendred *proſpicio*, *to look forward*, whereas it ſignifies rather *perſpicio*, *to look through*, as I ſuppoſe it ſhould be read. This ſignification being ſuppoſed, there reſults an excellent ſenſe; for by the words of the Chriſtians, denying that they were κακοποιοὶ, the truth could not be underſtood, which falſe pretenders to Vertue carefully conceal by deceitful words; but *by their good Works*, whereby the thing it ſelf is throughly diſcerned. For it could not but be a good Doctrin which made ſuch good Men. Chriſt ſhewing his Diſciples how they might diſtinguiſh Hypocrites from good Men, ſaith, *beware of falſe Prophets which will come unto you in ſheeps Clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous Wolves: Ye ſhall know them by their Fruits*, Mat. vii. 15. For tho they cunningly diſſemble their Wickedneſs, it is not long before it diſcovers it ſelf. But on the other hand, when we ſee any Man live well, and that for many Years, we eaſily perceive that Man cannot profeſs a Doctrin which favours Wickedneſs.

III. Our Author therefore, without neceſſity, recurs to *Heſychius*, and ſuſpects there is a miſtake here committed by ſome *Scribe*, or that ἐποπτεύειν is the ſame with ἐποπτεύειν, contrary to all Copies, and the Analogy of the Greek Language. But it is the greateſt Abſurdity imaginable,

ginable, what he says about the Verb ἐπισκοπέω, which never signified *suspicere*, but only *suspicari*, *to suspect*, for which signification there is here no place. Besides, the Latin *suspicere* is not *to look upon the ground*, but as it were from some low place to look upon another as above us, or reverence him. Our Author was scarce awake when he wrote this, and it does not seem to have been written by the same hand with the rest of his Annotations. Chapter II.

Ibid. *Note* g. I. No Body will doubt but פקודה *phkoudah*, ἐπισκοπὴ, *visitation*, signifies very often *Revenge*; but it is as well known that this word ἀναμφιστηρίζω *is ambiguous*, and signifies also God's Benefits. So that we may as fitly understand *the day of Visitation*, of the time in which God favourably *visits* the Heathens, when he converts them to the Christian Religion; and so the meaning of St. *Peter* will be: By your Conversation, so reconcile the Minds of the Heathens to the Christian Religion, as that they may at last acknowledg its truth, when God shall more fully set it before their Eyes. The *day of Visitation* signifies κατ' ἐξοχὴν the time when the Gospel is more fully and clearly revealed, as manifestly appears from *Luke* xix. 44. where Christ, speaking to *Jerusalem*, foretels all those evils which afterwards came upon her; *because thou knewest not*, saith he, *the time of thy Visitation*, ὁ ἐπεσκοπῆς σε, that is, wouldst not understand that God called thee, by my Ministry, to Salvation.

II. The fame of the Christians flight out of *Jerusalem*, does not seem to have so much as reached the Ears of the *Heathens* who lived in *Asia Minor*, or the Roman Magistrates, and those that attended them through the *Asiatick* Provinces; much less to have been taken notice of by them as a remarkable Deliverance. For a great while after the most learned Men among the *Romans*, did not distinguish *Christians* from *Jews*; as sufficiently appears by *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*. The *Halcyonian days*, which our Author tells us the Christians enjoyed throughout the whole Roman Empire, after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, are mere Dreams.

Vers. 20. Ποῖον γὰρ κλέος ἀμαρτάνοντες ὑπομένητε;] *Æschylus*, in his *Seven Captains that went against* Thebes, says something very much like this:

Εἴπῃς κακὸν φέρῃ τὶς, ἀισχύνης ἄτερ;
Ἔστ' μόνον γὰρ χέρδος ἐν τεθνηκόσι.
Κακῶν δ' κ' αἰσχρῶν ὕπο ΕΥΚΛΕΙΑΝ ἐρεῖς.

If any one suffer evil, without infamy, well and good; for this is only gain among the dead. But for wicked and vile Men [to suffer] *cannot be reckon'd*

Chapter III. *reckon'd any Glory.* Αἰσχύνη here ſignifies wickedneſs, the puniſhment of which is ſuffer'd, not without Shame and Infamy by him that commits it.

Verſ. 24. *Note* h. If the Apoſtles words had been, ὃς ὢν ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ ἤνεγκεν ἁμαρτίας, *who being upon the Tree, bare* our *Sins*, there would have been ſome place for Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation. But when St. *Peter* ſays, ἀνήνεγκεν, ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, *he took them up with his Body upon the Tree*, it is clearly not ſo much the expiation of Sins, as the *Mortification* of them, as the Apoſtles ſpeak, that is here ſignified. For St. *Peter*'s meaning is, that our Sins were as it were faſtened to the Croſs, that is, mortified, when Chriſt was lifted up upon it: See *Rom.* vi. 6. Ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ I render *with his Body*, becauſe as ἐν and ב in Hebrew is frequently ſo taken, ſo the Phraſe it ſelf will not bear to be otherwiſe rendred.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. OUR ſubtil Author ſees here two Hebraiſms, where others cannot ſee ſo much as one. Τὸ κρυπτὸν τῆς καρδίας, may be ſaid as well in Greek as in Hebrew; and ὁ ἔξω or ἔσω ἄνθρωπος is ſo true a Greek Phraſe, that it was uſed by *Plato*, as *Henr. Stephanus* in *Schediaſmatibus* has long ago obſerved.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. If St. *Peter* had made mention of ἁπλότης, perhaps there would have been ſome place for what our Author here ſays, of the corruption of compounded things; but becauſe he mentions no *ſimplicity*, it is nothing to the purpoſe. Inſtead of Ἡμίονος, he ſhould have written Ὀνείας, the word uſed by *Homer* Iliad. 1. verſ. 50. on which Verſe the *Scholiaſt* makes that remark which Dr. *Hammond* ſets down.

II. *The incorruptibleneſs of a meek and quiet Spirit*, wherewith St. *Peter* would have Women to be adorned, ſeems to be oppoſed to two things which are eaſily corrupted; *viz.* to the comelineſs of the Body, whereof a part is the *Hair*, which the Apoſtle had mention'd in the foregoing Verſe; and to *Apparel*, which is a thing much more liable to corruption than Gold, and which he likewiſe makes mention of. It's plain this Verſe is oppos'd to all the foregoing.

Verſ. 7. *Note* c. I. If the alledged place of Scripture were ſaid to ſignify any thing κατὰ γνῶσιν, I ſhould not doubt but that γνῶσις was taken for ſome ſecret Senſe, which the Jewiſh Allegoriſts ſought for in the Scripture. But it being ſaid that Husbands ought συνοικεῖν κατὰ γνῶσιν, *to dwell with them according to knowledg*, *giving honour unto the Wife as the weaker Veſſel*; κατὰ γνῶσιν is to manage the diſpoſitions of Women *skilfully* and prudently.

II. The

II. The examples, which our Author produces, are nothing to the purpose; for they do not contain any mystical interpretation of the places in *Genesis*, but consectaries deduced from the nature of Matrimony it self, and the plain words of *Moses*. The place in *Ephes.* v. 31. 32. I have interpreted, contrary to Dr. *Hammond*, and I shall not repeat what I have there said. Chapter III.

III. Συνοικεῖν properly signifies *to dwell together*, or to live in the same House, whence it was applied to all the Duties belonging to married Persons; whether the Discourse be about Procreation, or any other conjugal Office. So that the place in *Moses* concerning *multiplying*, is no more to the purpose, than *Plato*'s Fable about the Antient *Hermaphrodites*. Other things here might be corrected, which I pass by, but shall afterwards touch upon.

Ibid. *Note* d. Ἀπονέμων τιμὴν γυναικὶ, where the Discourse is about the Duty of a Husband towards his Wife, never signified, *to afford her Maintenance*; and tho τιμᾶν sometimes comprehends rewarding, it does not signify that alone. It may much more naturally and truly be interpreted *to honour* her, as who, being the *weaker Vessel*, is extreamly offended even with the bare appearance of Neglect.

Ibid. *Note* e. There is no doubt but χάρις signifies a Benefit, but some of the places alledged by our Author might a little otherwise be explained, as of *John* i. 14. I have shewed in a particular Dissertation, [inserted in this Volume.] In this place also χάρις ζωῆς, is *vivifying Grace*, or the Gospel, of which the Wife is said to have been made partaker no less than the Man, as *Grotius* has observed. But I had rather read with the *Vulgar* Interpreter συγκληρονόμοις ζωῆς, for here the Apostle extols not the Man, but the Woman, which in this respect is made equal to the Man. This the series of the Discourse seems to require.

Vers. 15. Ἁγιάζετε δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.] That is, know that God is Holy, or a lover of Sanctity. For this is often the signification of the Hebrew Conjugation Hiphil הקדיש *bikdiseh*, which is ordinarily rendred ἁγιάζειν. See my Notes on *Gen.* ii. 3. This sanctifying God in the Heart is the cause of our Sanctification before Men, spoken of in the following Verse, whereby we openly shew how Holy we esteem God. See *Levit.* x. 3. and *Num.* xx. 12. and my Notes on those places.

Vers. 19. *Note* f. I. On this place, our learned Author has collected a great many things, all which I have neither leisure to examin, nor is it worth my while, especially having interpreted the place here explained, in my Commentary on *Genesis*. And therefore in a few words I shall say, that the Apostle does not seem here to have

a

Chapter III. a reſpect to the place in *Geneſis*, cited by our Author. It is truly indeed rendred *my Spirit ſhall not abide in man*, and the thing is to be underſtood of the Soul of Man, as I have ſhewn on *Geneſis*. But the Souls of thoſe that lived before the Flood cannot therefore be called *Spirits in priſon*, nor can ירון *jadon* or ירין *jadin*, in *Hiphil*, be by any means deduced from נרן *neden*, which ſignifies *a ſheath*. It ſhould be read *jindon*, to be deduced from the Root נרן, which Dr. *Hammond* does not ſeem to have obſerved.

II. The πνεῦμα, by which Chriſt was raiſed, is truly underſtood of the Divinity which was afterwards in him, and was with God before *Abraham* was, and ſo in the beginning of all things, as St. *John* teaches us in the beginning of his Goſpel. But πνεύματα ἐν φυλακῇ ſignifies *Spirits keeping guard*, that is Angels who φυλάσσων *keep* men, as we are told in *Pſal.* xci. 11. The ſame are called עירים *birim*, *watchers*, in *Dan.* iv. 13. which may properly be rendered οἱ ἐν φυλακῇ, for *watchers* and *keepers* are all one. So that the Divinity is ſaid to have called the Men that lived before the Flood to Repentance, together with the Angels, who admoniſhed *Noah* to exhort them to a better Life. I ſhould render this place thus: *and being quickned by the Spirit, by which he went with the Spirits that watch, and preached to the unbelieving*, &c. When God is about to do any thing among men, he is repreſented as coming down from Heaven attended with a guard of Angels, of which I have ſpoken on *Gen.* i. 27. and xi. 7. and *Exod.* xx. 1. For this reaſon coming down with the Angels, to admoniſh *Noah* and command him to call men to repentance, he is ſaid *to have gone with the Spirits that watch*: and beſides, to have done that which *Noah* did in his name and by his command. The Example out of St. *Paul* in *Eph.* ii. 17. clearly ſhews, that St. *Peter* might ſpeak in this manner.

Verſ. 20. *Note* g. I. All that is here ſaid by our Author are vain Conjectures, which have no foundation either in things themſelves, or in the uſe of Scripture; tho he often repeats them, and that as very probable. (1) The Verb ἀπειθεῖν ſignifies, *not to believe*, *not to obey*; which is a heinous ſin, where the thing to be believed or done is of great importance; and a ſmall one where it is a matter of little moment. Here it ſignifies a great ſin, becauſe the men of the old world would not obey God, calling them by the Miniſtry of *Noah* to a better life. (2) Tho we can ſay nothing particularly of the ſins of the men who lived before the Flood; yet we may deny that it can be gather'd from the words of *Moſes* that they were corrupted with the ſin of παιδεραστία *Sodomy*, and other ſuch like. Tho they are joined with the *Sodomites* for their wickedneſs and πορνεία, it does not

not therefore follow that they were both guilty of the ſame kind of Impieties, different ſorts of wicked men being often joined together, and the ſame puniſhments ſuffered for divers crimes. (3) The Hebrew רעה *rabah*, and the Greek πονηρία, ſignify any ſort of vice, and therefore it might be put by St. *Luke* for ἀσωτία, *intemperance*, becauſe it is a more general name which comprehends under it the particular, not that thoſe words are ordinarily confounded. (4) It is true that φθορὰ and φθείρεσθαι ſometimes have thoſe ſignifications, which Dr. *Hammond* attributes to them, as alſo the Hebrew שחת *ſchibbeth*, uſed by *Moſes*; but they likewiſe ſignify in general any kind of depravation, or change for the worſe, in which ſenſe I ſhall take the word in *Moſes*, till it be evidently proved that a general ſignification, in him, can have no place. (5) The word חמס no more ſignifies *Violence* than any other ſort of Injuſtice, as I have ſhewn on *Gen.* vi. 13. So that what our Author builds upon that ſignification is vain, as all the reſt of his Conjectures which rely upon this foundation. Our learned Author often forges an Interpretation, by heaping together a parcel of very ſlight Conjectures; afterwards he raiſes what Superſtructure he pleaſes upon that interpretation; and then laſtly ſpeaks of the Conſectaries he thence deduces as ſo many certain Truths. But we ought not only to ſet bounds to our Conjectures, but eſpecially to the Conſequences we deduce from them, if we would not be in perpetual danger of erring. That danger no body here will be in, who ſhall ſuppoſe that the men of the old World were very wicked men; there being in that no conjecture, becauſe it is affirmed by *Moſes* in plain words: but whoever ſhall attempt particularly to explain what *Moſes* has ſaid in general, and give way in this matter to Conjectures, will find himſelf in the dark. And this may ſuffice to have been ſaid briefly againſt a way of interpreting Dr. *Hammond* too often takes. Chapter III.

II. It had been better to obſerve, that from the very Expreſſion of St. *Peter* it may be gather'd that πνεύμασιν ἐν φυλακῇ is not to be joined with ἀπειθήσασι; for thus he ſpeaks: ἐν ᾧ (to wit, πνεύματι) καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι, where after καὶ we muſt repeat ἐν, *by which, and by the ſpirits that watch be preached*; to whom? Namely, ἀπειθήσασί ποτε, *to them who were ſometime diſobedient*, &c.

Verſ. 21. *Note* h. I. I think ὃ is the true reading, not ὅ; and it might eaſily be, that ſome Tranſcribers not having another Copy to write after, but ſetting down the words from the mouth of a Prompter might confound ὃ with ὅ. Ἀντίτυπον σάρκισμα is uſed juſt in the ſame ſenſe as if it were ſaid ὅμοιον *like*, as the Word is manifeſtly taken in

Chapter IV.

Heb. ix. 24. on which place see my Note. A *pattern* is called ἀντίτυπον, from the similitude which it has with the τύπος or ὑποτύπωσις; whence the vulgar Interpreter tranſlates it *ſimilis formæ*. The other interpretations Dr. *Hammond* gives of this place are forced.

II. He ſays indeed truly, that ἀντίτυπον ſometimes ſignifies *contrary*, which might be proved from ſeveral places in *Xenophon*, but not that which he alledges out of *Hiero*; where ἀντίτυπα is not ſimply *contrary*, but *dura, hard*, σκληρά, that is, *ſevere*, as it is rightly rendered by *J. Leunclavius*.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 1. Note a. OUR Author here ſays that Saint *Peter*'s phraſe in verſ. 6. of this Chapter is *hard*, and I do not deny it; but I ſay alſo that he is a *hard* Interpreter, if ever any one deſerved that name. For here, as one ſaid, *lapides loquitur, he ſpeaks ſtones*, not words to mollify hard phraſes. The whole ſenſe of this verſe depends upon a particular Elegancy ariſing from the ambignity of the phraſe παθεῖν σαρκί, *to ſuffer in the fleſh*, or *to the fleſh*; which being uſed of Chriſt, ſignifies *that he ſuffered and died in his humane nature*, or *for the ſake of our humane nature*, i. e. of men. But when we are ſaid to *die* or *ſuffer to the fleſh*, we are underſtood to be no longer devoted to the fleſh, or to the vices of the fleſh: and accordingly St. *Peter*'s meaning is this; ſeeing I ſay that Chriſt *has ſuffer'd to the fleſh*, ye alſo who ought to imitate him as far as ye are able, know that *you muſt ſuffer to the fleſh*, in a ſenſe which is agreeable to you, to wit, wholly renounce it: for he that *has ſuffered to the fleſh, has ceaſed from ſin*. Juſt ſuch another ſort of reaſoning we have in *Rom.* vi. 10, 11. in the place parallel to this. *For in that he died* (inſtead of which St. *Peter* here ſays *ſuffered*) he DIED UNTO SIN *once*; *but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewiſe reckon ye alſo your ſelves to be* DEAD *indeed* UNTO SIN, *but alive unto God.* Inſtead of *to die unto ſin*, here is *to ſuffer to the fleſh*; but both theſe phraſes have the ſame ambiguity in them. *Theſe* places ſhould have been compared, not *verſe* 6. with this, which have no affinity with one another.

Verſ. 3. Ἀβουλήτους εἰδωλολατρείαις.] *Grotius* on this place ſays *it is idololatriæ quædam ſpecies adeſſe ſodalitiorum ἐρανικῶν, de quibus profecta falſis Diis dantur, & in hac maxime re credibile eſt Judæos antequam Chriſtiani eſſent, accommodaſſe ſe Gentium moribus: a ſort of Idolatry to be preſent at ſuch common feaſts where part of the meat is offered in ſacrifice to falſe Gods; and in this particular eſpecially, it is probable the Jews, before they were Chriſtians, conformed themſelves to the manners of the Heathens.*

And

And I do not deny but this might be done by them, but there having been among the Jews every where a great number of Proſelytes, of which many embraced the Chriſtian Religion, I rather think St. *Peter* has a reſpect here to theſe, who had formerly been Idolaters. Chapter IV.

Verſ. 6. Ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι.] None but Dr. *Hammond* could have thought that κριθῆναι σαρκὶ was the ſame as to *die to the fleſh*, who could digeſt any impropriety, tho never ſo great, in his own ſtile. But it is much more natural to interpret it; *ſo that they were condemned indeed in the fleſh, according to men*; that is, put to death by the judgment of men, as to the body; *but live according to God in the Spirit*, that is, their Souls were made partakers of eternal life by God. This is the uſual ſignification of the words, which ought not to be changed without reaſon.

Verſ. 14. *Note* f. This is all forced, the meaning is evidently this: *If ye are reproached for the name of Chriſt* (that is, becauſe ye will be called Chriſtians) *happy are ye*; *becauſe the Spirit of glory and of God reſteth with you*; that is, thoſe reproaches are ſo far from being a ſign that the Spirit hitherto beſtowed upon you by God, and which has brought ſo much glory to the Goſpel, departs from you, that on the contrary it ſo much the more *reſteth*, or will more conſtantly abide with you, as long as ye ſtedfaſtly profeſs the Chriſtian Religion. The *Spirit of glory and*, as it is in the Alexandrian Manuſcript, *of power*, καὶ δυνάμεως, is the Spirit of Miracles, which was conferred upon Chriſtians. Δυνάμεις often ſignifies *Miracles*, and δόξα the ſame. See my Notes on *Exod.* xvi. 7. and *John* i. 14.

Verſ. 15. *Note* g. As I do not ſcruple diſagreeing with our Author, when the matter ſeems to require it, ſo I am ready to commend his inventions when they are ſuch as this interpretation. Ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος is in all probability the ſame with ἀλλοδιοικητὴν, that is, who does or takes care of other mens buſineſs; by which word the Greeks ſignify thoſe who uſurp other mens offices in a Commonwealth. *Plato* lib. iv. *de Repub.* where he at large proves that all Orders of men in a Political Society have a certain and determinate buſineſs, which they ought to take care of, and that therein conſiſts the juſtice and peace of a Commonwealth, towards the end ſays, that the contrary is injuſtice. Οὐκοῦν, ſaith he, φαῦλόν τινα οἶμαι τῶν τριῶν ὄντων τούτων, καὶ πολυπραγμονοῦντα, καὶ ἀλλοδιοικοῦντα, καὶ ὑπανάστασιν μέρους τινὸς τοῦ ὅλου τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιχειροῦντα, ἀλλὰ τούτου ὄντος δίκαιον εἶναι πρᾶττειν ἑκάστῳ τὸ οἰκεῖον τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἀρχικῷ γένει ὄντι: *Igitur ſeditionem quandam horum trium hanc eſſe oportet, & affectionem quandam quæ nimis multa aggreditur, alienaq; munera invadit, & rebellat pars quæpiam animi adverſus totum, ut in illo imperet id quod non par eſt, quippe quod eſt ejus naturæ*

Chapter V.

ut deceat id ſervire ei qui eſt ex proſapia imperantium. Suidas: ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπῶν, ἐχθρῶς βουλεύομαι, *to take ſpiteful counſels.* Then he produces theſe words out of an antient Writer. Ἐσιμωῦντο μηδὲν ἀντὶ ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπῶν, μηδὲ πραγματῶν: they obſerved him *not to meddle with other mens buſineſs, nor to endeavour alterations. Budeus* in *Comment. Ling. Græc.* gives us alſo other examples. And it is eaſy to diſcern that ἀλλοτριεπισκοπία is all one with ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπῶν; becauſe the chief word, of which theſe names are compounded, is the ſame. So that what Dr. *Hammond* obſerves, is very pertinent in this place.

Verſ. 17. *Note* h. The ſenſe of the Hebrew words is this: *Behold the righteous uſe to be puniſhed on earth, how much more the unrighteous and the ſinner?* For the verb שלם is ambiguous, and ſignifies either *to reward* or *puniſh*. But the *Septuagint* thought *Solomon* had a reſpect to that ſignification of the verb שלם which is, *to be ſafe*, and inſtead of בארץ read באוץ *beots*, which ſignifies *in ſtraits*, or *in haſt*, and which they render μόλις, becauſe they that eſcape out of any danger by a haſty flight, or are brought into great ſtraits, *hardly* ſave themſelves.

CHAP. V.

Verſ. 1. Συμπρεσβύτερος.] Thus St. *Peter* calls himſelf, out of modeſty, not becauſe he executed any where the Office of a Biſhop, who was inveſted with a much higher, *viz.* that of an Apoſtle. Biſhops or Elders, properly ſo called, had the overſight but of one Church, from which they were not to depart; but the Apoſtles were Biſhops and Elders of all the Churches in the World, and could not be confined to one particular place. Beſides, he did not write this Epiſtle from *Rome*, but from *Babylon* a City of *Egypt*, as learned men have ſhewn, and I have obſerved at the end of the Premonition to this Epiſtle.

Verſ. 3. *Note* b. I. The Verb ποιμαίνειν *to feed*, is indeed truly here uſed to ſignify the Office of a Biſhop, and ποίμνιον *flock*, to ſignify the Church; but it does not therefore follow that the reſt of the words here uſed are taken from *Shepherds*. No body ever ſaid that Shepherds, properly ſo called, are πάρεδροι of the Sheep, when he going before, they follow him, except Dr. *Hammond*. No body would ſay that ἑκουσίως and αἰσχροκερδῶς are applicable to Sheep, properly ſo called, which belong to reaſonable Creatures; not at all to Sheep, which are forced to follow with blows, unleſs they go along with the reſt by natural inſtinct.

II. It is true indeed that, whilſt the Roman Commonwealth ſtood, the Roman Magiſtrates choſe their Provinces by lot, which therefore might

might be called their *lots*, to whom they fell by lot. But I can't tell whether, among Latin Writers, or those Grecians that have written about the Roman Affairs, *sors*, or κλῆρος, are ever used for *a Province*; at least as I never read any such thing, so I could not find any example of it in the Writings of Learned men, who do not use to omit such things. I dare also affirm, that no Greek Writer ever said κλαυσιδίου κλήρου, for that which is, to vex Provinces by Tribute or Extortion. Chapter V.

III. Our Author seems to have believed a Fable, which some Writers of no repute formerly divulged, about the division that was made of the World by Lots among the Apostles; which even *Baronius* himself did not absolutely give credit to. Κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς, in *Acts* i. 25. is *part of the Apostleship*, not a Province which *Matthias* obtained by Lot. See Dr. *Hammond* himself on that place. He had much better here have followed *Grotius*, whom the Reader may consult.

Vers. 5. Ἀλλήλοις ὑποτασσόμενοι.] *Ye younger*, saith he, *be subject to the elder; and all be subject one to another:* that is, let the younger give way to the elder, and comply with their Admonitions; and the elder, on the other hand, shew themselves courteous to the younger, not scrupling to yield to them, and comply with them, when there is a just occasion. Here the discourse is about an ὑποταγὴ which is a consequent of Meekness and Courteousness, and whereby we easily yield and comply with one another; not about that Obedience which is due to Church-Governors, from those who bear no Office in the Church. Therefore the Apostle says, ALL *be subject one to another*; which shews him to speak of a thing that belongs to every one, and which is a mutual duty. See my Note on *Jam.* v. 16. and *Eph.* v. 21.

Vers. 13. *Note* d. See what I have said about this matter on the *Premonition.*

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
Second Epiſtle General of St. *Peter.*

AT the end of the *Premom.*] For my part, as I profeſs my ſelf to be of Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion as to the Apoſtle *Peter*'s being the Writer of this Epiſtle; ſo I cannot forbear ſaying that our learned and pious Author deals a little unfairly with *Hugo Grotius*. I. He ſuſpects here and elſewhere, without reaſon, that the Poſthumous Annotations of *Grotius* had not paſt his review before they were publiſhed, as alſo that there were ſome things mixed with them by another hand, contrary to his real ſentiments. But it appears both by *Grotius* his Epiſtles, lately publiſhed, and others, that the learned *J. Mercer*, a man of unqueſtionable integrity, received all theſe things from *Grotius* himſelf, and his Widow, to be ſet forth, and publiſhed them as he had received them. But *Grotius* is here and elſewhere miſtaken. As if that Learned man had been exempted from all danger of error! It's plain all theſe things have one and the ſame ſtyle, and are written in the ſame ſtrain; and I do not think it would have been an eaſy matter in *France*, or elſewhere, to find a man that could have obtruded his own works inſtead of *Grotius*'s upon the more judicious ſort of Readers. II. Beſides, why did Dr. *Hammond* not take notice that there are other reaſons, for which both antient and later Writers have ſuſpected this Epiſtle, drawn from the ſtile, which is not like that of the former Epiſtle? Did not he know that *Joſ. Scaliger* alſo, who was afterwards followed by *Cl. Salmaſius*, thought this Epiſtle to be ſuppoſititious? Methinks all this may much extenuate *Grotius* his error, who only ſtudied for new arguments to confirm the opinion of thoſe great men. III. What our Author alledges out of Chap. iii. 1. to prove that this is a ſecond Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, is of no force, if that Chapter it ſelf be a ſecond Epiſtle of *Simeon*, as *Grotius* conjectures, whom he ought to have confuted. IV. The comparing of *Grotius* his Annotations on *Mat.* xvii. with thoſe he has on *Chap.* i. 17. of this Epiſtle, does not prove that

that these were written by another hand; because *Grotius* might have changed his Opinion, as he plainly here acknowledges. If Dr. *Hammond* had lived longer, and carefully reviewed his own Annotations, I doubt not but he would have alter'd a great many things which I have corrected in him. V. They that have rejected this Epistle as falsly attributed to St. *Peter*, have not stuck to say that the Person of that Apostle is here ill represented, *Scaliger* having adventured to affirm that it is *commentum veteris Christiani otio suo abutentis, The invention of some antient Christian who did not know how to employ his time better.* VI. *Grotius* did not infer from *Simeon* Bishop of *Jerusalem*'s writing this Epistle, as he supposed, that it was written after the destruction of *Jerusalem*; but on the contrary, from its being written after the destruction of that City, that we must find out some Writer who survived it, to whom this Epistle might be attributed, and whom he thought to be this *Simeon*, because of the likeness of the name. VII. It cannot be denied that the Christians, who had read *Mat.* xxiv. did not expect the consummation of all things before the destruction of *Jerusalem*; but it did not therefore follow that the last Day of all the World was immediately to follow that Destruction. So that tho the Christians were here commanded to wait patiently for the last Judgment, it would not follow that this Epistle was written after the demolishing of *Jerusalem*. This I had rather say, than deny there is any mention here made of the last Judgment, as Dr. *Hammond* does with the greatest confidence, in opposition to most other Interpreters. VIII. Our Author followed, as he ordinarily does, *Cæs. Baronius*, as to the year of Christ in which St. *Peter* suffer'd Martyrdom. But *Ant. Pagus* contends that it happen'd in the year of Christ LXV, and Dr. *Pearson* in LXVIII, whom I chuse to follow. But if we suppose St. *Peter* died at *Rome*, in the Year which Dr. *Hammond* thinks, and that he wrote this Epistle a little before his Death, it cannot be said that the Jewish War was then approaching, which began in the xiith of *Nero*, and in the iid of *Cestius Florus* President of *Judea*, and of *Christ* LXVI, and in the Month of *May*. See Dr. *Pearson*'s *Annales Paulinæ*.

Chapter I.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 3. *Note* a. INstead of διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, the *Alexandrian* Copy and others read ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, *by his own Glory and Vertue*, *propria gloria & virtute*, as the Vulgar Latin also hath it. Which way soever of these we read it, the sense will be the same. Christ, namely, hath called us διὰ δόξης, or ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ, by the extraordinary.

Chapter I. nary Miracles which he wrought, as Dr. *Hammond* well obſerves; and by his *Virtue*, that is, by his moſt holy Example, whereby we are as much affected, as by his preaching; nay without which all his preaching would be vain and inſignificant. They are miſtaken who by καλέσαντα here underſtand God the Father, becauſe it is to be underſtood of Chriſt, who himſelf called the Apoſtles and firſt Diſciples; whom he won to himſelf not only by the excellency of his Doctrin, but by the Miracles he wrought, and the Sanctity of his Life. Beſides, ἀρετὴ no where ſignifies *Miracle, power.*

Verſ. 4. Δι' ὧν.] By *the Miracles* and *Vertue* of Chriſt are ſaid to be given unto us great and precious Promiſes; becauſe they accompanied the Word he preached, and added weight to it; without which it would have had no greater influence upon Men than the Doctrins of Philoſophers, which did not work upon many, becauſe there were no Miracles wrought in confirmation of them, and they themſelves often contradicted them in their Lives.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. No one will doubt but that ἐπιθυμία often ſignifies a deſire of unlawful fleſhly Pleaſures, and, if the Diſcourſe be about that, of thoſe which are contrary to nature; but that it may be thought to have thoſe extraordinary ſignifications, the circumſtances of the place muſt require it. Otherwiſe it may be reaſonably thought that word is taken in general for any *Deſire* or *Luſt* whatſoever. The ſame may be ſaid of the word φθορὰ, which ſignifying any corruption of Manners, does ſometimes peculiarly denote what our Author here ſuppoſes to be refer'd to. But I ſee in this place no circumſtance which ſhould oblige us to take thoſe words in any other than a general ſenſe. For the Apoſtle ſpeaks of that amendment of Life to which Chriſt called all Men; and therefore it is probable that *the Corruption through Luſt, which is in the World*, ſignifies any ſort of Vice which Chriſt would have us renounce.

II. *To corrupt a Youth*, where the Diſcourſe is about a Man, and unnatural Luſt, ſignifies what our Author ſays; but when young Men are ſaid *to corrupt* a Maid, all we can think is meant by it, is the deflouring her, as in the Paſſage cited out of *Palladius*. The *corruption* which *Socrates* was accuſed of, was nothing but a depravation of Manners and Temper, not that peculiar Wickedneſs which our Author ſpeaks of. This appears from the Apology of *Socrates*, written by *Plato*. And in the ſame ſenſe we muſt underſtand the words of the counterfeit Epiſtle of *Heraclitus* to *Hermodorus*, as appears only by the Paſſive voice uſed by the falſe *Heraclitus*; for ſuch an abuſe could not be put upon *Heraclitus*, who was then well ſtept in Years. In the places

ees of the New Teſtament, there is no reaſon why we ſhould depart from the general ſignification of Corruption. So that it would have been better if Dr. *Hammond* had here followed *Grotius*. Chapter I.

Verſ. 5. Τῳ ἀρετῳ.] Our Author, after *Grotius* and others, ſeems to have rightly interpreted ἀρετῳ here by ἀνδρειᾳ in his Note on *verſ.* 3. But he did not carefully enough read the place of *Euripides* in *Stobæus* his *Florileg.* Tit. vii. for the firſt Verſe is produced out of his *Bellerophon*, the laſt out of *Euripides* his *Ægeus*, and ſhould be divided into two Dimeters, as it is in *Grotius* his Edition.

Ibid. *Note* c. Becauſe our learned Author often ſpeaks of this γνῶσις, and the *Gnoſticks*, to whom I have ſhewn that he refers a great many things without neceſſity, and in this place ſets himſelf more particularly to explain the original of their Name; it will not be amiſs, if I alſo treat here of that matter in a few words.

I. I cannot deny but γνῶσις, which is a general name for any ſort of *Knowledg* or Learning, is ſometimes taken properly for Chriſtian Knowledg, and where the Diſcourſe is about the Myſtical ſenſe of Scripture, for the underſtanding of Myſteries. It is uſed ſeveral times in this ſenſe in the Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, as I have thereon obſerved. But I ſhould not compare the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, by which the Minds of the Evangelical Prophets were fitted to underſtand obſcure places of Scripture, with the Jewiſh *Cabbala*. For this without any regard had to the literal ſenſe, taken from the proper or metaphorical ſignification of words, and the ſeries and occaſion of the Diſcourſe, deduces *any thing out of any* place of Scripture, and relies either upon trivial reaſonings to prove what it aſſerts, or very uncertain Tradition; ſo that if any deny it, there is no means left to convince them, and thoſe that believe it do ſo upon inſufficient grounds, and may be made to believe any thing, tho never ſo unreaſonable. But the Chriſtian Prophets, who received their Knowledg from *the Spirit of Truth*, alledged nothing out of Scripture that was not in it, and could not be deduced out of it by Grammatical Reaſons. Otherwiſe Prophecies muſt have been explained by Prophecies, and the new Prophets atteſted to by Miracles, to make it believed, that ſuch a thing was contained in the Old Prophets, becauſe they affirmed it to be ſo, which otherwiſe no Man could have ſeen in them; which method of acting does not ſeem worthy of the Spirit of God, as I have ſhewn out of a learned Man on *Matt.* i. 22. I acknowledg that in the Writings of the Apoſtles, there are ſeveral interpretations of places of Scripture more like Cabbaliſtical than Grammatical ones; but wherever we find them, they are uſed only as Arguments to con-

Chapter I.

vince the *Jews*, and in compliance with their Opinions and Practices, not as demonſtrations to Perſons of different Sentiments.

II. It is very true that the word γνῶσις ſometimes ſignifies a profound knowledg of the Chriſtian Religion, and ſo is taken in a good ſenſe, as manifeſtly appears from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who often ſo uſes that word, both elſewhere, and in *Strom.* Lib. vi. out of which I ſhall produce a few words, ſo much the rather, becauſe from them we may gather the reaſon why the Apoſtle here joins *Knowledg* with *Faith* and *Virtue*. Now he in *pag.* 648. ſpeaks thus: Τελειωμένη φάναι (ἐντεῦθεν ἡ πίστις ἡ γνωστικὴ) πάντων ὕπερτέρημα εἶναι καὶ πάντων φιλοπτικὸν βεβαίᾳ καταλήψει κεχρημένον, καὶ ὅτι περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπόρων, ἢ ὄντι γνωστικόν· ὑπῆρξεν ἐν Ἰακώβῳ, Πέτρῳ, Ἰωάννῃ, Παύλῳ, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἀπόστολοι: *we dare ſay (for here is the Faith enlightned with Knowledg) that a true* Gnoſtick *knows all things, and underſtands all things, having a firm comprehenſion, even of thoſe things whereof we doubt; ſuch as were* James, Peter, John, Paul, *and the reſt of the Apoſtles.* Then he adds, γνώσεως δὲ πλήρης ἡ προφητεία, ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ Κυρίου δοθεῖσα, καὶ διὰ Κυρίου πάλιν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις σαφηνισθεῖσα· καὶ μή τι ἡ γνῶσις ἴδιωμα ψυχῆς πυγχάνει λογικῆς, εἰς τοῦτο ἀσκηθεῖσα ἵνα διὰ τὴν γνῶσιν εἰς ἀθανασίαν διαγειρῇ; *for Prophecy is full of knowledg, as having been given by the Lord, and by the Lord again manifeſted to the Apoſtles. And is not Knowledg a property of a reaſonable Soul, trained up to this, that by Knowledg it may be entitled to Immortality?* Afterwards he ſhews that Action muſt be preceded by Knowledg; and contends that nothing is ἀκατάληπτον *incomprehenſible*; which is true, if we ſpeak of things neceſſary. For whatever it is neceſſary for us to underſtand, to attain Salvation, we can undoubtedly underſtand. At length he thus deſcribes a *Gnoſtick*: Ὁ γνωστικὸς ἡμῖν, περὶ οὗ λέγω, τὰ δοκοῦντα ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς καταλαμβάνει· πιστεύσας ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀκατάληπτον τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἀδίδακτον—Εἰ δέ τις πολυπραγμοσύνην ποιεῖ τις, οἶδε τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἐκδέχεται· ἐπίσταται στρεβλὰς λόγων καὶ λύσεις αἰνιγμάτων, σημεῖα ἢ καὶ τέρατα προγινώσκει, καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων ὁ τῆς σοφίας μαθητής: *And the* Gnoſtick, *of whom I ſpeak, comprehends thoſe things which ſeem to others to be incomprehenſible, believing there is nothing incomprehenſible to the Son of God, and therefore nothing which cannot be taught ——If any deſire the knowledg of many things, he knows what paſt of old, and conjectures what will be hereafter. A Diſciple of Wiſdom can diſcover the deceitfulneſs of words, and unfold Riddles; he foreknows alſo Signs and Wonders, and the events of Times and Seaſons.* So that γνῶσις is taken for a more exquiſite degree of *Knowledg*, and γνωστικὸς, *a Perſon profoundly knowing*. Hence St. *Peter* exhorts Chriſtians to join to their Faith γνῶσιν, that is, the higheſt degree of Knowledg poſſible.

III. It appears indeed, from the Writings of the Apoſtles, that γνῶσις

γνῶσις signifies such a Knowledg; but I don't know whether it hence follows that the Disciples of *Simon* were by an *Antonomasia*, called even at that time *Gnosticks*, or assumed to themselves that name. There is no place alledged from whence this can be concluded. Besides, I don't know whether all that *Epiphanius* says of the later *Gnosticks* be true, much less do I believe him in every thing concerning the Antient. *Epiphanius* is not a Person whose affirmation should easily be credited, where he accuses and inveighs against the antient Hereticks. Yet I do not take upon me to defend the cause of these Men, of whom there are no Records come to our hands: But I leave the matter undecided. Chapter I.

IV. It is true indeed that in the Epistle of *Barnabas* many places of the Old Testament are explained Allegorically, and several Mysteries unfolded, which otherwise no one would have discerned in them. But they are interpretations much more like the Jewish *Cabbala*, and the greatest part of them undoubtedly vain, if not also false; but yet fit for the *Jews* of that Age, according to whose Opinions rather than to Truth, *Barnabas* reasons. So that I should not account this γνῶσις of his, the same with that Christian Knowledg which is so highly extolled by *Clemens*. I would alledg some examples out of him, but that the Epistle of *Barnabas* was this last Year M.DC.XCVII, published at *Amsterdam*, with all the Annotations of all Interpreters upon it.

V. In many places indeed St. *Peter* opposes the Errors, which in his time were spread among Christians, and the evil Practices of some Men; but whether those Errors sprang from *Simon Magus*, and were defended by some particular Sect, who were notorious for their Wickedness, is to me uncertain.

Vers. 16. *Note* e. I. The first circumstance, from which our Author gathers that the Transfiguration shadowed out the coming of Christ to punish the *Jews*, and deliver the Christians who dwelt in *Palestine*, is altogether vain; because there were at least *six days* interval between the Discourses he mentions, and the Transfiguration, as will appear by St. *Mark* Chap. ix. 2. if we compare his words with *Luke* ix. 28. It is not likely that Christ spent so many days silently, without teaching his Apostles any thing all that while, or inculcating upon them what he had already said; which if he did, there will be no force in Dr. *Hammond*'s reasoning, which is grounded only upon this, that the forementioned discourses were made by Christ, immediately before his Transfiguration.

II. *Secondly*, what he here says about the ἔξοδος of Christ, and his com-

Chapter I. paring it with the *Exodus* of *Moſes*, are mere niceties, as eaſily rejected as they were invented. I have ſhewn on *Luke* ix. 31. that ἔξοδος there ſignifies a warlike expedition againſt the obſtinate *Jews*.

Verſ. 17. *Note* f. Our learned Author *triſſes*, when he ſubtilly diſtinguiſhes the μεγαλειότης, *Majeſty* or *Greatneſs* of Chriſt, from the *Voice* that was heard. For that Voice was no ſmall part of the μεγαλειότης of Chriſt, becauſe thereby he was pronounced the *Son of God*, and commanded *to be heard*. This is clear from the very order of the Diſcourſe: *we were witneſſes of his Majeſty.* Λαβὼν ΓΑΡ, *FOR he received from God the Father, Honor and Glory, ſuch a Voice coming to him.* By this very Voice, Majeſty, Honour and Glory were conferred on Chriſt. St. *Peter* ſays they were ἐπόπται and ἀκόυσται, becauſe in the Transfiguration they had *ſeen* ſome things, and *heard* others. I had rather with *Grotius*, after λαβὼν underſtand ἦν *was*, than look here for a Hebraiſm, were it only for the Particle ὑπὸ, which in ſuch an order of words cannot be joined with an abſolute Caſe.

Verſ. 19. φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ.] In the *firſt* place, I would have φαίνοντι here to be underſtood in the Preterimperfect Tenſe; as if St. *Peter* had ſaid λυχνῷ ὃς ἔφαινε, *a Candle which ſhined*, that he may be thought to ſpeak of the Time which preceded the Coming of Chriſt. *Secondly*, I ſhould render αὐχμηρὸν τόπον, with the *Vulgar* and *Beza*, *caliginoſum*, *a dark*, or *obſcurum locum*, *an obſcure place*, not that αὐχμηρὸς properly ſignifies *obſcure*, which primarily ſignifies *dry* and *naſty*; but becauſe Dungeons which are *naſty*, are alſo *dark*, therefore αὐχμηρὸς here is not *naſty*, but *dark*. And the time which preceded the Coming of Chriſt is fitly called *dark*, compared with that which ſucceeded it; as the Knowledg which Men had of Religion under the Old Teſtament, is aptly reſembled to the light of a *Candle*, in compariſon of the *Sun* of Righteouſneſs *Chriſt Jeſus*, which being then actually riſen, I ſhould render the words of St. *Peter* thus: *Until the Day dawned, and the morning Star aroſe in your Hearts.* St. *Peter* here tells the Chriſtians, they did well that they read the Prophets, not as the only Rule of Faith, and a perfect and full Revelation of the Will of God; but as Books which they formerly, when they had nothing more clear and full, made uſe of with great Advantage, till Chriſt came and taught them all things. Our Author ſtrains this place in his Paraphraſe, whilſt he applies it to the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

Ibid. *Note* g. I. It is true that καρδία ſignifies the Mind in Scripture, but it is not oppoſed here to *Heaven*, than which nothing could have been ſaid more flat; when the thing it ſelf ſhews, to any one of common ſenſe, that the *morning Star* is to be underſtood in a metaphorical

cal ſenſe. The *morning Star*, and the *Day* here ſignifie, the Doctrin of the Goſpel, compared with the Old Teſtament; which is ſaid to be *riſen in our Hearts*, when it is not only heard, but ſinks down into our Minds, ſo that we heartily believe it. Chapter I.

II. To incourage the Chriſtians to bear patiently the Perſecutions which they ſuffer'd in *Judæa*, in expectation that their Perſecutors ſhould be deſtroyed, it had been improper to propoſe to them the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament about that matter, which were very obſcure; when they had clear ones deliver'd by Chriſt, recorded in *Mat.* xxiv. and the parallel places of the other Evangeliſts.

III. Tho I will not deny but the *Day of Chriſt*, and *the Day*, are uſed for a time of Vengeance; yet wherever theſe Phraſes occur, we ought not preſently to apply them to that time, as our Author too often does. Becauſe he had interpreted ſome places of the New Teſtament not unhappily, about ſome vile Men whom he calls *Gnoſticks*, there is ſcarce ever any thing ſaid about Impoſtors, or wicked Men, where he does not think the ſame Perſons to be ſpoken of. The like fault he commits almoſt wherever the Diſcourſe is about *the Day*, or about *the coming of Chriſt*, which he ſtrains to the Vengeance taken upon the *Jews*, overlooking all Circumſtances. For tho in his Paraphraſe the ſeries of the Diſcourſe ſeems to have a reſpect thereto, that is of no moment, becauſe he adds to the words of the Apoſtles what he pleaſes. In this place the *morning Star* and *the dawning Day*, are the Goſpel, *until* which the Law and the Prophets continued in force, which were like *a Candle* in the greateſt darkneſs wherein Mankind lay. Afterwards as the light of a Candle is quite obſcured by the light of the Sun, they were not of ſo great uſe, but yet not to be deſpiſed. The Goſpel is often compared to Light, as in *Mat.* iv. 16. and *John* i. 5. & *ſeqq.* The condition alſo of the *Jews* before the Goſpel, is compared to darkneſs in the ſame places. All which clearly enough ſhew that the Interpretation commonly received, is better than Dr. *Hammond*'s.

Verſ. 20. *Note* h. As ἀφετήρια ſignifies the place from whence the Racers ſtarted, not ἐφετήρια, the Apoſtle ſhould have ſaid ἐπίλυσις *ſending out*, and not ἔπιλυσις *ſending in*, if he had had a reſpect to that Agoniſtical Exerciſe. I had rather interpret ἔπιλυσις as it were *a looſing of the Tongue* or *Mouth*; for as *they* are ſaid to have their Tongues tied who cannot ſpeak, ſo the Mouth or Tongue of thoſe that ſpeak are ſaid *to be looſed*, ἀναλύεσθαι. *Rob.* and *Henr. Stephani* will ſupply us with examples to this purpoſe in their *Theſauri*. So that the meaning of St. *Peter* will be this, that the Prophets did not *open their Mouths*, *ora reſolvere*, or στόμα ἀναλύεσθαι, of their own accord, but by the Will of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 1. Ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.] If the *Gnoſticks* had been already every where ſpread, as our Author both in his Paraphraſe and his Annotations often inculcates; St. *Peter* would never have uſed the future Tenſe, *there ſhall be*, *ſhall bring in*, &c. I wonder Dr. *Hammond* did not obſerve this.

Verſ. 3. Ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ.] The following Verb, ἐμπορεύσονται, *they ſhall make Merchandiſe* of you, clearly ſhews that πλεονεξία here ſignifies *Covetouſneſs*, tho our Author, carried away by prejudice, interprets it *Filthineſs*. But I have already confuted him on *Rom.* i. 29.

Verſ. 5. *Note* a. This obſervation our Author owed to *Sam. Bochart*, who treats of the ſame things more fully in his *Phaleg.* Lib. 1. c. 3.

Verſ. 10. Τὸν ὀπίσω σαρκός.] This Verſe is thought by Dr. *Hammond* to belong to the *Gnoſticks*, whom he ſuppoſes to have been by birth *Heathens*; but it as fitly agrees to thoſe wicked *Jews*, who took the ready way to deſtroy themſelves and their Nation by their Seditions, whom *Joſephus* exactly deſcribes in many places of his *Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War*. From this Writer, who was an Eyewitneſs of what he relates, it certainly appears that there were ſuch Men as thoſe; but it does not appear from any credible Author, that there were in *Judæa* at that time Dr. *Hammond*'s *Gnoſticks*.

Verſ. 12. *Note* b. Our Author is miſtaken when he interprets the words ἄλογοι and φθορᾶ actively, as appears by the very laſt word of the Verſe. *But theſe as living Creatures, void of Reaſon, made by nature* εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν *to be taken and deſtroyed, ſpeaking evil of the things which they underſtand not, ſhall periſh* καταφθαρήσονται *in their deſtruction.* For therefore it is ſaid of them that καταφθαρήσονται, *they ſhould be corrupted*, not that *they ſhould corrupt*, becauſe they were like living Creatures, deſigned by nature to be taken by men and killed. See *Grotius* on this place.

Verſ. 13. *Note* c. Seeing our Author had begun to borrow from *Grotius* what he here ſays, he ought with him to have added that it was read ſo by the *Vulgar* Latin Interpreter.

Verſ. 14. *Note* d. Our Author ſhould not have cited, *Plutarch de Verecundia*, for there is no Book of *Plutarch*'s which has that Title; but *de Vitioſo Pudore*, περὶ δυσωπίας. That Rhetorician or Orator was called *Amphicrates*, as we are told by *Longinus* de *Sublim.* cap. iv. on which ſee Interpreters.

Verſ.

Verſ. 15. *Note* e. I. Our Author does not ſpeak accurately, when he ſays that the *Chaldeans* pronounced *Ain* ע like S, for that is not true, and whenever they wrote that Letter, they pronounced it like the *Jews*. But his meaning was that צ *Tſade* is changed into the Gutural ע *Ain*, and therefore it was poſſible the former might be ſometimes written for the latter; whence it came to paſs that בצור, which is expreſſed in Greek by βόσορ, was written for בעור *bebor*. Chapter III.

II. If St. *Peter* here has a reference to the *Gnoſticks*, as our Author thinks, and the *Gnoſticks* had already crept into moſt Chriſtian Churches, as the *Doctor* contends; I don't underſtand why St. *Peter*, in the beginning of the Chapter, ſhould uſe the Future Tenſe. But if we underſtand him to ſpeak of the wicked *Jews*, who had not yet joined themſelves to the Chriſtian Aſſemblies, but yet would join themſelves to them after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, there will be no ſuch difficulty.

Verſ. 19. Ὧ γάρ τις ἥττηται τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται.] The Apoſtle here has a reſpect to the firſt original of Bondage, which was the effect of Victory, and is thus expreſſed by *Juſtinian* in *Inſtit.* Lib. 1. Tit. 3. de Jure Perſonarum; *Servi ex eo appellati ſunt, quod Imperatores captivos vendere, ac per hoc ſervare, nec occidere ſolent. Qui etiam mancipia dicti ſunt, eo quòd ab hoſtibus manu capiuntur. Servi —— fiunt, aut jure gentium, id eſt, ex captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo, major viginti annis, ad pretium participandum ſeſe venum dari paſſus eſt. Servants were ſo called, becauſe it was the Cuſtom of Commanders to ſell their Captives, and to that end* ſervare *to keep them, and not kill them. Which were called alſo* Mancipia *Slaves, becauſe* manu capiuntur, *they were taken captive by the Enemy.* Men *become Servants, either by the Law of Nations, that is by Captivity; or by the Civil Law, when a Free-man above twenty years of Age, to enjoy part of the price, ſuffers himſelf to be ſold.*

Verſ. 22. *Note* g. This Etymology is given by *Sam. Bochart* in *Hieroz.* Part 1. Lib. ii. c. 57. but he adds others altogether as likely.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 1. Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν.] *Grotius*, leſt theſe words ſhould be thought to ſhew that St. *Peter* wrote two Epiſtles, of which this was the ſecond, contends that *this is the beginning of a new Epiſtle of the ſame* Simeon, and that the former *was comprehended in two Chapters.* But it was never the Cuſtom to ſend Epiſtles without any Inſcription, tho they were written to thoſe to whom others had been ſent before. This appears from the ſecond Epiſtles

Chapter III. ſtles to the *Corinthians*, to the *Theſſalonians*, to *Timothy*, &c. So that there is no ſufficient reaſon why we ſhould think this to be the beginning of a new Epiſtle.

Verſ. 2. Τῶν εἰρημένων ῥημάτων.] That is, of the Doctrin of the Prophets and Apoſtles, which our Author without reaſon interprets only of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*; who on this Chapter has out-done himſelf in ſtraining the Scripture, to prevent our thinking that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the end of all things. But a faithful Interpreter ought not to apply general words to a peculiar ſenſe, unleſs the thing it ſelf, or the ſeries of the Diſcourſe, requires it; which cannot in this place be pretended.

Verſ. 3. Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν.] That is, as *Grotius* well obſerves, *hereafter*, which I have already elſewhere ſuggeſted: ſee my Note on *Gen.* xlix. 1. But our Author interprets it of the laſt Age of the Jewiſh Commonwealth, which was preſent at that time wherein he ſuppoſes this Epiſtle to have been written. So that, according to Dr. *Hammond*'s Hypotheſis, St. *Peter* ought not to have ſaid, ἐλεύσονται but ἦλθον *came*; for thoſe wicked Men which the *Doctor* thinks are here meant, muſt have been already come, or they never would come. Beſides, who can bear that ἐμπαίκται *Scoffers*, ſhould be ſaid to ſignify a mighty defection from the Chriſtian Religion? And what defection happen'd between the XIIth year of *Nero*, in which the *Jewiſh* War began, and *Jeruſalem* was firſt beſieged by *Ceſtius Gallus*, and the ſecond and laſt Siege of that City? When the *Jews* were reduced to great ſtraits by the *Romans*, and there were evident Tokens of their approaching Deſtruction, there was no reaſon why any ſhould revolt to them; nor do we read that the *Romans* at that time in *Judæa* compelled the *Jews*, or the Chriſtians, to renounce their Religion, and worſhip the *Roman* Gods. Nay when the Chriſtians had ſeen the Prophecy of Chriſt fulfilled, concerning the firſt Siege of *Jeruſalem*, and after that was raiſed, had retired to *Pella*; there was no reaſon left to doubt concerning that Coming of Chriſt which our Author here ſpeaks of. And this happen'd in the XIIth year of *Nero*, from which time the *Jews* ſuffer'd innumerable Calamities; for in the beginning of the next Year *Veſpaſian* came with an Army. Our Author had not well conſider'd this, when he thought there might be *Scoffers* in the XIIth year of *Nero*, when the *Jews* were to be deſtroyed, and all the ſigns of their Deſtruction were then preſent. Nay the moſt diſcerning part alſo of the *Jews* themſelves had a great while before begun to think that their Affairs were in a bad Condition, as we are told by *Joſephus* in Lib. vii. *of the Jewiſh War*, cap. 12. and elſewhere.

Ibid.

Ibid. *Note* a. I. I ſhall ſay nothing about the ſignification of the word לצים *letſim* in the Old Teſtament, but whether St. *Peter* has a reſpect to that I do not know. Yet however that be, the *Scoffers* mentioned by St. *Paul* were no better than thoſe of old. I am apt to think they were ſome of the Sect of the *Sadducees*, or ſuch a ſort of men, who denied the reſurrection of the dead, and the future judgment; and derided thoſe that believed them. That which follows will ſhew the Apoſtle had ſome ſuch thing in his thoughts. Chapter III.

II. Such men muſt neceſſarily, unleſs they diſagreed with themſelves, *walk after their own luſts.* For thoſe that expect nothing after death ought in reaſon to indulge themſelves in any ſort of pleaſure, at leaſt as far as it can do them no hurt in this life.

III. The Apoſtacy ſpoken of by St. *Paul* in 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 3. may more fitly be underſtood of the defection of the Jews from the Romans, againſt whom they took up arms; than of the Apoſtacy of the Chriſtians to any other Opinions, as I have ſhewn on that place. The paſſage alſo in 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. is not neceſſarily to be underſtood of thoſe times, becauſe it may very fitly be interpreted of any time after that of the Apoſtles; for ὑστέροις χρόνοις ſignifies any *after times.* Tho there is ſome ſimilitude between the deception of theſe, and thoſe ſpoken of by Chriſt in *Mat.* xxiv. it does not follow they were the ſame. Nor are there wanting Hereticks, to whom what St. *Paul* ſays may very properly be applied.

IV. I will not deny that St. *Peter* here ſpeaks of the *Gnoſticks*, provided we underſtand him of thoſe that were after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, whom the Antients deſcribe. Πρῶτον here ſignifies not *firſt* in time, but *eſpecially*, as *Grotius* well obſerves.

Verſ. 4. Πῦ ἐστι ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ.] That in this place the Apoſtle has a reſpect not to the coming of Chriſt to puniſh only the Jews, but to judg all mankind, appears by the following words, where theſe *Scoffers* ſay that all things continue as they were *from the beginning of the Creation*; which does not belong to the Jews, but to all Mankind, whoſe ſeveral Ages had ſucceeded one another from the beginning of the World. I know our Author thinks there are two objections in this Verſe, but doubtleſs he is miſtaken; for it is but one, conceived in theſe words, *Where is the promiſe of his coming?* which is confirmed by the following: ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ, FOR *ſince the fathers fell aſleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation.* Which words do not contain a new objection, but an enforcement of the former; for becauſe no change had happened among mankind, generally conſidered, tho the Prophets were thought to have often foretold the laſt Judgment,

Chapter III. therefore the Scoffers said, *Where is the promise of his coming?* The Apostles had spoken much more clearly of that coming, and oftner inculcated it than the Prophets; whereby it came to pass, that the objection was with greater shew of strength renewed against them. For which reason St. *Peter* here gives a particular and full solution to it.

Ibid. *Note* b. I. Our Author ought in the first place, to have produced an example, by which it appeared that ἐφ' ᾧ signifies, *except that*, or something like it; for no body will believe him barely affirming what no one perhaps before ever observed.

II. Secondly, those wicked men derided the promises of the divine Judgment, and so of the Resurrection; because since those *Fathers*, to whom that promise was made, whoever they were supposed to be, not excepting *Adam*, were dead, there had been always the same succession of men dying and being born, and no Generation hitherto, from the beginning of the World, had been ever raised from the dead, and called to Judgment. That perpetual succession for so many ages had perswaded them, as they said, that it would always be so, and that the coming of Christ to judg Mankind was promised in vain. To that objection St. *Peter* first answers, that as the Earth had been of old created, with the water, which was mixed with it, and whereby wicked men had been punished in the time of *Noah*: so it would once be that the Earth being dissolved by means of Fire, which is in nature, bad men should be punished thereby. Which is just as if he had said, that the change which will hereafter be made with fire, ought as easily to be believed, as that which had been of old made with water. This is clearly the sense of this place, which shews the discourse to be about the end of the whole World, not of the Jewish Commonwealth only.

III. If the Unbelievers, St. *Peter* opposes, had rejected only that which was said concerning the ruin of the Jewish State, they would not have used such an argument as this, that there had no change happened since the beginning of the World; because no one was so senseless as to deny that both many other Commonwealths had been destroyed, and the Jewish State had been overthrown in the time of *Nebuchadnezzar*, to omit other calamities that befel it. All, except a few furious Jews, were afraid of the destruction of that Commonwealth by the Roman Power, which at that time not only lay heavy upon its neck, but was also an enemy to it. St. *Peter* likewise would not have recurred to the Deluge to prove that the Jewish Commonwealth was to be destroyed, but to the History of that Commonwealth, and to the power of the Roman Empire, and the actions of the Romans. I need say no more in so clear a case.

Vers.

Verſ. 5. *Note* c. I had rather, with *Grotius* and others, interpret Chapter
λανθάνει of wilful ignorance; for they who objected ſuch things againſt III.
the Apoſtles, were not unacquainted with the ſtory of the Flood, be-
cauſe that ſtory was known by the Heathens themſelves. Nor could
our Anthor think it was unknown to the *Jews* or *Gnoſticks*, to whom
he attributes the foregoing objection. And therefore he interprets
λανθάνει in his Paraphraſe, not of ignorance but of careleſneſs, or want
of conſideration. But I prefer the former interpretation, for the fore-
mentioned reaſon.

Verſ. 7. *Note* e. I. It is true that the *whole* is ſometimes expreſſed by *all* or *ſome* of its parts, by which no more is ſignified, than by the ſingle name of the whole. But I don't think that the *heavens and the earth* any where ſignifies either the earth alone, or this ſublunary region. At leaſt no place ever occurred to me in which theſe words were ſo taken. See alſo my Note on *Col.* i. 20.

II. Our Author in his Annotation ſays, that the words, *heaven and earth*, ſignify *Jeruſalem*, but in his Paraphraſe he makes no mention of their having any ſuch ſignification. Which yet he ought to have done, if that were true which he had obſerved on the foregoing verſes concerning the objection of the *Scoffers*. For if St. *Peter* here ſpeaks of the concluſion of the whole World, he ſpake before of the ſame. But if he ſpake before of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, he diſcourſes of the ſame alſo here. So that the 7th verſe, as it is explained in the Doctor's Paraphraſe, has no connexion with the foregoing.

Verſ. 8. Μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ χίλια ἔτη.] If our Author's mind had not been prejudiced and taken up with a falſe interpretation, he would eaſily have ſeen that St. *Peter* in theſe words had a reſpect to the delaying of the *laſt judgment*. For that which he aims at in them is, that a delay perhaps of many ages might not ſeem long, and that no one might therefore cry out, *Where is the promiſe of his coming?* No ſuch thing could be ſaid about the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, which St. *Peter* certainly knew would ſhortly happen, becauſe of Chriſt's prediction, and which, when the Jewiſh War began, diſcerning Perſons might almoſt foreſee. It is abſurd to ſpeak of a thing that is to come to paſs in a ſhort time, as if it were at the diſtance of ſeveral thouſand years, as St. *Peter* here would ſpeak, according to Dr. *Hammond*'s opinion. If he had thought of the extinction of the Jews, he would have ſaid undoubtedly that the thing would come to paſs in a little time, and that there was no need of any long patience.

Chapter III. Verſ. 10. *Note* f. This interpretation of our Author is falſe in all reſpects. Ῥοιζηδὸν is properly *ſibilo, ſtrideo, to biſs, to gnaſh* or *rattle*; and ῥοιζηδὸν is not ſimply *with a noiſe*, but with a *rattling*. This is the proper ſignification of it, which ought not, without reaſon, to have been forſaken. Beſides, σφοδρῶς is not *ſwiftly*, but *vehemently*, in *Phavorinus*. The reaſon alſo, taken from the compariſon of a Thief in the night, is of no force: for it is not ſaid that the day of the *Lord* will come ῥοιζηδὸν, *as a thief in the night*; but that *the Heavens will paſs away with a rattling noiſe*, when that ſudden and unexpected day comes as a Thief. The coming of the Lord is compared to the coming of a Thief, becauſe both are ſudden, not becauſe the Lord will puniſh the Wicked without noiſe.

II. It is utterly falſe, that the Deſtruction of the Jews was ſo ſudden and unexpected: for certainly after *Veſpaſian* had entred into *Judea*, it was not difficult to conjecture that there was an end of the Jewiſh Commonwealth, to thoſe who were able to compare the ſtrength of the Jews with that of the Romans. Even before, under the Government of *Geſſius Florus*, and when *Ceſtius Gallus* came into *Judea*, the Anger of the Romans was loudly enough proclaimed againſt the Jews.

Ibid. in *Note* g. Col. 2. Lin. 2. after the words, *teſtified by Predictions.*] By the way here I ſhall advertiſe the Reader, that the *Chapters* of *Joſephus* are to be underſtood according to the Latin Diviſion, and that there is a fault in the citation of the Paſſage where *Joſephus* ſpeaks of the burning of the Temple, which is ſaid to be in *lib.* 3. *c.* 9. when it is in *lib.* 7. which ſeems to be a miſtake in the Print. Beſides, what Dr. *Hammond* here ſays about *the fatal day*, as out of *Joſephus*, is grounded only upon the Latin Tranſlation of *Sig. Gelenius*, which runs thus: *Evolutiſque temporibus, aderat fatalis dies, qui erat decimus menſis Auguſti.* But in the Greek the thing is otherwiſe worded; to wit, πεμπτῳ δ' ὑ εἰκαδὶ μηνὸς, χρόνων περιόδοις, πμέρᾳ δεκάτῃ Λὼϊ μηνὸς: *And their fate came, in the revolution of times, in the tenth day of the month* Lous. Which ſhews that Dr. *Hammond*'s obſervation is vain. But let us hear him ſtraining the words of St. *Peter* to the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem.*

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] I. When our Author refers us to his Premonition, for proof that St. *Peter* here ſpeaks of the exciſion of the *Jews*, and not of the end of the World, he makes a mere circle; for what he ſays there is grounded upon theſe violent Interpretations, which if falſe, what he affirms in his Premonition muſt of neceſſity be falſe alſo. It is true indeed, that the Prophets, when

when they describe a great change in the Affairs of an Empire or Commonwealth, make, if I may so speak, *Heaven and Earth meet together (cœlum terræ miscent)* and use such like Phrases. But here the circumstances of the place shew that the Discourse is about the end of all things. See my Notes on *Vers.* 7. and 8. Chapter III.

II. I acknowledg the word στοιχεῖα frequently signifies the Planets, and the signs of the Zodiack, as is at large shewn by *Æg. Menagius* on Lib. vi. S. 102. of *Diogenes Laertius*. But it being added here to the *Heavens*, there can be no doubt but we are to understand the starry Heaven, in which those elements are. The word οὐρανὸς, when it is alone, is ambiguous, and may be understood as well of the lower regions as of the upper: but when it is joined with the Planets, or the Stars, it ceases to be ambiguous, and signifies the starry Heaven; as on the contrary, when it is said *the birds of heaven*, the word *Birds* shews it to signifiy the air. But it is the greatest absurdity imaginable, because the στοιχεῖα are in the starry heaven, to say that that word signifies what is in the Air, the Clouds, Birds, &c. Which can neither be made out by reasoning, nor confirmed by any use of the Greek Language, or of the sacred Writers.

III. Nor is there any better ground for what our Author says about the distinct signification of *the heavens* and *the earth*; for the style of the Prophets in this matter is such, as he himself observes on *vers.* 7. that every word has not a particular signification, but the whole discourse one general meaning. But Dr. *Hammond* when he has any thing to prove, often takes up every thing that lies in his way, not excepting those things which elsewhere he himself has confuted.

Vers. 16. *Note* h. I. I agree with Dr. *Hammond* in keeping here to the ordinary reading. But the rest of what he says is so forced, that I wonder so learned a man could satisfy himself in that wherein he will satisfy no one else. It is a mistake that St. *Paul* in most of his Epistles speaks of the destruction of the Jews, as I have shewn against our Author in several places; on the contrary, nothing is more true than that he ordinarily speaks of the last judgment. It is false that in the destruction of *Jerusalem* there was any thing δεινὸν; for what was there in it hard to be understood? Was it strange that a sinful nation should be punished by God, or that *Jerusalem* should be demolished, which had formerly suffered the like under *Nebuchadnezzar?* Was it difficult at that time to understand that the Jews were oppressed by the Romans, whose subjects they then were? To none certainly but Fools or Madmen. It is needless to confute what our Author here says, about the series of St. *Paul*'s discourse from *vers.* 3. which I have already shewn that he misinterprets.

Chapter III.

II. As it is improbable, considering the thing it self, that Christ did not know the point of time in which *Jerusalem* was to be destroyed; so it is yet more improbable, that that Destruction was so very unexpected at the time when this Epistle was written, and the whole Jewish Nation had broke out into Rebellion, and divided themselves into several Factions. Whoever reads *Josephus* of the Jewish War, will easily see that Dr. *Hammond* invented what he thought would serve to confirm his Hypothesis, and did not take it out of History. Of the place in *Acts.* i. 7. consult *H. Grotius.*

III. Our Author perpetually speaks of the Destruction of the *Gnosticks*, as a concomitant of the destruction of the Jews; which would be tolerable, if the discourse were only of those that were in *Judea*, and feigned themselves to be Jews: But what was this to the *Gnosticks* that dwelt in other Provinces of the Roman Empire? What did the Calamities which befel *Judea* concern also the Christians that lived elsewhere, except that they saw the Prophecies of Christ accomplished in them? There was no need likewise of their being carefully admonished, that the particular point of time was unknown wherein *Jerusalem* was to be burnt, because from the disturbances that were in *Judea*, they might easily conclude that it was near at hand. The only thing the Apostles could then do in this matter, was to admonish the Jews that had embraced the Christian Religion, and lived elsewhere, that they should not go into *Judea*, nor enter into *Jerusalem*, unless they would incur the same danger as threatned *Palestine* and that City.

IV. Many might abuse those Passages of S. *Paul*, in which he describes the last Judgment, as if it were near at hand, because the time of it was uncertain. See 1 *Thess.* c. iv. and v. 1 *Cor.* xv. and 2 *Cor.* v. It was now ten years, or more, since he had wrote in that manner to the *Thessalonians*; from whence some might conclude that he was deceived, and so revolt from the Faith they had received from him. But this was not properly συνήθως, but other circumstances of the Judgment, of which the greatest part are συνήθως to those who judg of them by humane experience. Such things might more easily στρεβλοῦσθαι *be wrested*, than those which Dr. *Hammond* speaks of; tho it's true what might not be wrested by ignorant and wicked men; when our learned and pious Author, serving an Hypothesis, has so strangely wrested both this Chapter and many other places of the New Testament, contrary to all the Rules of Grammar, and Accounts of History.

ANNO-

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

First Epistle General of St. *John*.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] Of the *Gnosticks* and the *last Hour* I shall speak on the places where Dr. *Hammond* treats of them.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 1. Ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.] That which had been said and done by Christ from the beginning of the Gospel, is here opposed to the new Doctrines of false Prophets. Besides this, we have an indirect intimation here of the Writer of this Epistle, who was from the beginning with Christ, which was necessary to make an Apostle. See *Acts* i. 21, 22.

Vers. 5. *Note* a. I will not affirm, with our Author, that the Apostle here has a respect to the *Gnosticks*, the disciples of *Simon*; who did not, as those to whom St *John* speaks, hope to attain Salvation by Christ, seeing, if what the Antients say be true, *Simon* opposed his Apostles, and said that he himself was Christ, as we are told by *Irenæus* lib. i. c. xx. who also says that *Simon* affirmed in so many words *secundum ipsius gratiam salvari homines, that men were saved by his grace.* If St. *John* had been to oppose *Simon*, he would in the first place have shewn, that he lied in calling himself Christ. But they seem to be bad Christians, who abused the Gospel which the Apostles preached; which they pretended to have embraced, and whose errors the Apostle here confutes. *Light*, in the style of the New Testament, signifies holiness; and *darkness* wickedness. See the Epistle of *Barnabas* towards the end, where he discourses of the *way of light*, and *the way of darkness*.

Vers. 10. *Note* b. That the *Gnosticks*, that is the followers of *Simon Magus*, who did not believe in Christ but *Simon*, are here referred to,

I do

Chapter I. I do not think: for these refused to be accounted the disciples of the Apostles, nor did the Apostles join themselves to them; and therefore St. *John* would not have confuted them, as he here does, for it is sufficiently manifest that he confutes men that lived among the Christians. I rather think he has a respect to some Jews, who were not throughly sensible of the sins they had committed whilst they were Jews, and in which they still lived after their conversion to the Christian Religion. These ought to acknowledg that they *had sin*, that is, as St. *John* afterwards speaks, that they *had sinned*, and so had deserved punishment for their past sins; which unless they did, *they made* Christ *a liar*, because they denied they stood in need of his Redemption, when he had taught that he came to redeem all the World; for he that has not sinned, is liable to no punishment for sin, and needs not a Redeemer. Besides, upon that confession of their sins, it was consequent that they should renounce them, if they would *have fellowship* with Christ, as he speaks in *verse* 7. that is, be his true disciples, whom he would make partakers with himself of eternal happiness. By this we may understand why St. *John* says he writes these things to Christians, *that they sin not*. But tho he uses this phrase γινώσκειν χριστὸν, *to know Christ*, it does not presently follow he alludes to the *Gnosticks*, because all who professed to embrace the Gospel, said that they therefore embraced it, because they *knew* that Jesus came from God. Such allusions must not be recurred to, but when the thing cannot well be understood without an allusion. Otherwise whenever the Apostles use the Verb γινώσκω, where the discourse is about the knowledg of the Christian Religion, or those things which concern it, we must always recur to the *Gnosticks*, who it is not certain in the Apostles age were so called. Besides, to find out Dr. *Hammond*'s conceptions in St. *John*, innumerable things must be supplied, and added; than which way of interpreting, nothing can be imagined more uncertain.

CHAP. II.

Vers. 1. Παρακλῆτον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.] What our Author says in his Paraphrase about the Prayers of the Church, is indeed true, but does not belong to this place, in which St. *John* does not speak the least word about the Church. And therefore I had rather he had omitted it, and reserved it for a fitter place; for it is a deceitful Paraphrase, which assumes things that are neither expressly contained in the words of the Apostle, nor necessarily deduced from them. Our Author every now and then imposes his own conceptions upon the Reader

Reader instead of St. *John's*. This by the way, lest I should seem to approve of Dr. *Hammond's* insertions, if I had taken no notice of them. Chapter II.

Vers. 18. *Note* b. I. I had rather our Author had contented himself with a more general Assertion, and said that St. *John* here had a respect to divers *false Christians*, which at that time had revolted from the Christian Church, and the Doctrin of the Apostles, whether they were *Simon's* Disciples, or others. For this only being affirmed, there would have been no need of interpreting several words of this Chapter, not so much as they truly signify, as according to the signification which he would have to belong to them, that he might find in them his own Opinion. Read what he says of the five things foretold by Christ, which he supposes to be spoken of in this Chapter as fulfilled; and compare it with St. *John's* own words, and it will appear that a great many things must be supplied in them, to make out Dr. *Hammond's* interpretation.

II. *Polycarpus* is said by *Irenæus* Lib. iii. c. 3. to have saluted *Marcion* when he met him once at *Rome*, *primogenitum Satanæ*, *The first-born of Satan*. And to him, or rather to any Hereticks who did as he says, he seems to have had a respect, not to the *Gnosticks* only.

Ibid. *Note* e. I. I will not exclude indeed *Simon* and his followers out of the number of these *Antichrists*; but that name signifying, as is well observed by our Author after *Grotius*, both those *that oppose Christ* directly, whilst they deny that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is the *Messias*, or was a true Man; and those who take upon themselves *to be Christs*, or put themselves in the *place of Christ*, I don't see why we should think the Apostle here to have a respect to the *Gnosticks*, more than to any others, who did either of those things. It's true, those *Antichrists* are said to have *gone out* of the Christian Assemblies; but who knows whether others, besides the *Gnosticks*, that were half *Jews*, did not depart from the Christian Churches? There being no historical Records of the Christians of those times, we cannot certainly determin any thing about this matter.

II. Our Author thought that ἀντιποιῶν signified that which is called in English *to counterfeit*, in French *contrefaire*; but his Memory failed him, for ἀντιποιῶ signifies only *contra facio*, *adversarius sum*, *altercor*, *par pari reddo*, *aggredior*, *vindico*, *rependo*; *To counterwork*, *to resist*, *to contend*, *to return like for like*, *to set upon*, *to revenge*, *to repay*. Yet it is true that the Preposition ἀντὶ, as when alone, so in Composition signifies that which Dr. *Hammond* affirms; for it signifies *loco*, *in the place of*, and *pro*, *for* as well as *contra*, *against*; so that the name ἀντίχριστος

Chapter III. may truly be applied not only to him who directly opposes Christ, but also who puts himself *in the place of Christ*, tho he denies nothing concerning Jesus. So ἀντιλλάσσω is to *exchange*, that is, to give and receive one thing *for another*; ἀντιδίκος is *one that comes in the place of another Man*; ἀντικαθίστημι is *to substitute*; ἀντιλογῶν, *to compensate*; ἀνθύπατος, *a Proconsul*, &c.

CHAP. III.

Verſ. 19. *Note* e. I. OF this word Dr. *Hammond* has treated on *Gal.* i. 10. and interpreted it in the ſame ſenſe as he does here; but I have ſhewn on that place that he is miſtaken. Here alſo the expreſſion is *Elliptical*, for πείσωμεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, *we ſhall perſwade our Hearts*, is a doubtful Phraſe, for the underſtanding of which, we muſt repeat out of the foregoing words, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐσμέν; that is, we ſhall be conſcious to our ſelves, *before God*, that we are truly Chriſtians. St. *John* teaches us that he is a true Chriſtian, who helps his Neighbour not in Words, but in Deeds; and from that true Beneficence only can conclude himſelf to be a good Man, and reſt throughly perſwaded of it in his own Mind. But he that aſſiſts his Neighbour only in words, when he is able indeed to relieve him, if he deceives others, yet he cannot deceive himſelf, but is conſcious to himſelf before God of Uncharitableneſs. And St. *John* adds ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, *before him*, to wit, God, becauſe God only is witneſs of the Judgment which we ſecretly paſs upon our ſelves. Hence that noted expreſſion in Scripture, *to be juſt before God*, to ſignify a true and ſincere Vertue, becauſe God alone is the true and infallible judg of it. See *Luke* i. 6. and Interpreters on that place.

II. Τελειοῦσθαι κατὰ συνείδησιν, is to be purged ſo by a τελειτὴ, as to be conſcious that God is propitious to us. See my Notes on *Heb.* ii. 10. & vii. 11.

CHAP. IV.

Chapter IV. Verſ. 2. Πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστιν.] The words ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα muſt be rendred, as Dr. *Hammond* well obſerves in the Margin of the Engliſh Tranſlation, not *that* [Jeſus Chriſt] *is come in the Fleſh*, but *which is come in the Fleſh*. But beſides, this whole Period is to be underſtood thus: *every Spirit that confeſſes Jeſus, who is come in the Fleſh, to be the Chriſt, is of God.* Such another Expreſſion there is in St. *John*'s Goſpel *chap.* xvii. 3. where ſee my Note. So alſo St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xii. 3.

Οὐδεὶς

Οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, that is, *no Man can say* Chapter V.
that Jesus is the Christ, but in the Holy Ghost. In St. *John*'s words there are three things contained, *first*, that Jesus the Son of *Mary*, who was called a *Nazarene*, was the *Messias*, which the *Jews* denied; *secondly*, that *Jesus* was come in the Flesh, that is, was truly a Man, and subject to the inconveniencies of human Life, which many of the first Hereticks denied, if we believe the Antients; *thirdly*, that they could not be rejected as Impostors, who said that Christ was the true *Messias*, and a Man like us. But it may be enquired whether there could not be Impostors who confessed both, and yet maintained other pernicious Errors? There might without doubt, but at that time all the Impostors offended in one or other of these points, and to them St. *John*'s marks must be referred; not to all Impostors which might be, or which afterwards appeared.

Vers. 12. Τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν.] That is, it appears by the love which we have for one another, that our love to God is most perfect, which otherwise is not τετελειωμένη, but ἀτελὴς, when we have some degree indeed of Piety towards God, but do not heartily enough love our Neighbour. Such were the *Jews*, who professed to love none but those of their own Religion, and were not sincere even in that: see *Cap.* ii. 5. Our Author in his Paraphrase of this and the following Verses, is very harsh, and scarce knows how to speak his own Thoughts, so far is he from happily expressing the mind of the Apostle.

CHAP. V.

Vers. 6. *Note* a. I. IF I should undertake to examine particularly all the foregoing medly, I should be obliged, instead of short Additions, to write a long Dissertation. And therefore I shall touch only upon the chief things. I do not disagree with our Author about the interpretation of the 6th *verse*, but I wonder he spends so many words in endeavouring to make out the Connection of *vers.* 7. with that, and the meaning of the words *are one*, or *are to one*, before he had shewn, or endeavoured to shew that this Verse and those words are genuin. Of such an order in discoursing it may be said, ἄνω ποταμῶν χωρῶν πηγαί. But to pass by this, Dr. *Hammond* does but wrangle with all the most learned Interpreters, who interpret *are one* of consent. And the reason why they understand those words of consent, is, first, because they are so taken in *John* x. 30. & xvii. 21. secondly, because here the Discourse is about a unity of Testimony, and not about a unity of Nature. But why is this consent other-

Chapter V. wise expressed in the following Verse? I answer, for variety sake, or also by mere accident; for in this simple stile words must not be so subtilly scanned or watched. All our Author here alledges besides, is foreign to the purpose, and the scope of the Apostle.

II. As for his saying that tho the *Alexandrian*, and many other antient Manuscript Copies, omit the *7th Verse*, yet it is read in many other Manuscripts, and all the printed Copies except one; that, to say no worse of it, is not accurately said. For in the old Greek Copies, that is, which were written seven or eight Ages ago and older, it is no where read, and seldom in those that are later. In the most antient Latin Copies likewise it is not read, tho frequently in the New. *Beza* alledges a British Greek Copy, mention'd by *Erasmus*, and a Spanish Complutensian Edition, and several Copies of *R. Stephanus*, which have this place. But besides that these do not sufficiently agree with one another, they are by no means to be equal'd with the most antient Copies, which with great consent reject this Verse; and are confirmed by the Authority of all the Greek and Latin Fathers until St. *Austin*, who never used this place against the *Arians*, or other antient *Antitrinitarians*; tho they often make mention of the three Witnesses on Earth, as learned Men have long since observed. For as for our Author's objecting St. *Cyprian*, *Jerom*, and *Ambrosius*, that is to no purpose, as we shall presently see. There are more printed Copies than one, which omit this place; but tho they all had it, their Authority would signify nothing against the Manuscript Copies, and the consent of Antiquity.

III. The conjecture about the omission of some *Scribe*, because of the repetition of the like words, as it takes place elsewhere, so it cannot here be allowed; *first*, because it must be supported by another Conjecture; and *secondly*, because it opposes all Antiquity. For who will believe that such an omission was admitted in all the Copies, which the Christians used privately and publickly for several Ages; and afterwards was discovered by I know not whom, without the help of any antient Copy? Who but those who have no regard to truth, and think that Truth may be defended by the help of Falshood? Our Author's reasonings against the suspition of this place being supposititious, are insignificant, because they cannot be opposed to the joint Authority of the antient Copies, Fathers, and Interpreters. Besides, who does not know, that tho Truth may be well defended, and relies upon solid grounds, yet the Orthodox, as well as others, invented innumerable falshoods to support it? Whence came so many supposititious Books in antient times, but from this perverse practice? But here it

is

is to be obſerved, that it might eaſily be that theſe words were inſert- Chapter
ed into the Context, not out of any deſign to deceive; but ſome Bo- V.
dy having in the Margin of his Copy, over againſt the 8th Verſe, no-
ted that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, was ſignified in this place,
others afterwards put that into the Text; as is conjectured by *Ric.*
Simon, who has ſet this matter in a clear light, in his *Critical Hiſtory*
of the New Teſtament P. 1. c. 18. and his *Diſſert. concerning the* Manu-
ſcript *Copies of the* New Teſtament added to the 3d *Part*, to whom I
refer the Reader. The places our Author here alledges to prove the
Doctrin of the Trinity, might have been found in any Theological
Syſtem, and in greater number: nor do they make any thing to con-
firm the ordinary reading, for every thing which is agreeable to the
Chriſtian Faith, is not preſently the true Reading. Whereas he adds,
that if this place had been corrupted by the Orthodox, the *Arians*
would have taken notice of it; tho that ſhould be admitted as a forcible
Argument, it would ſignify nothing to this place; which ſeems to have
been inſerted very lately, ſeeing none of the antient Fathers, Greek
or Latin, till the time of St. *Auſtin*, ever alledged it againſt the *Arians*.
Conſult the foremention'd Monſieur *Simon*.

IV. The paſſage cited out of St. *Cyprian*, does not prove that he
read this place, as we read it in the printed Copies, but only that he
underſtood the words of the 8th *Verſe*, of the Father, Son and Holy
Ghoſt; which is ſo clearly demonſtrated by Mr. *Simon*, that a Man
muſt be very obſtinate, after reading his reaſons, to aſſert the contra-
ry. Our Author produces a place out of *Tertullian* in Lib. *Contra Prax-*
eam, without adding the Chapter or Page; which is a very bad Cuſtom,
in a thing eſpecially of ſuch great Moment. So that I was forced to
read the greateſt part of that Book, to find out the place, which is in
Cap. xxv. *p.* 515. of the *Paris Ed.* An. 1675. But *Tertullian* has not
a reſpect to this place in the 1ſt *Epiſtle* of St. *John*, but to *John* x. 30.
For theſe are his words: *Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paracleto,*
tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero: qui tres unum ſunt, non unus,
quomodo dictum eſt: ego & pater unum ſumus; *ad ſubſtantiæ unitatem,*
non ad numeri ſingularitatem. The conjunction of the Father with the
Son, and of the Son with the Comforter, makes three cleaving together
one upon another; which three are (unum) *one thing, not* (unus) *one*
as it is ſaid; I and my Father are (*unum*) one thing; *as to unity of Sub-*
ſtance, not as to ſingularity of number. He no where alledges this place
in 1 *John*, which yet in that diſputation he ought to have alledged, if
it had been read at that time, as it is now; ſeeing he often alledges
the place in *John* x. which is not ſo expreſs to his purpoſe. *Praxeas*

was

Chapter V.

was of the opinion of *Sabellius* or *Photinus*, who thought that there was but one Person in the Godhead; so that perhaps he might have abused this place in St. *John*, and so have alledged it; or if this place had been thought to be contrary to him, it would have been alledged against him. St. *Jerom*'s name is prefixed indeed to the Preface to the Catholick Epistles; but that it is not his Preface has been shown by Mr. *Simon* in the 2*d* Part of his *Critical History* of the New Testament, c. ix. and the Benedictine Monks, who have lately begun to set forth the Works of St. *Jerom* at *Paris*, tho very great Adversaries to Father *Simon*, have confirmed his Arguments, so that they seem to have stopped the Mouth of Obstinacy it self; which Dr. *Hammond* also would have acknowledged,

Si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in ævum,

If he had lived to this day. As for St. *Ambrose*, it is not without intolerable Negligence that his words are not set down; because Dr. *Hammond* knew that he would not be believed in this matter. But really there is no where any such thing in the true St. *Ambrose*. And if such a fault had been committed by *F. Socinus*, our Author would not have spared him so easily, as he forgave himself.

V. He would have done much better, towards the confirmation of the Truth, to adhere only to the Scripture, and not to recur to the Fathers, whose opinion was quite different from that which is now received; as who, properly speaking, affirmed that there were three consubstantial Gods, as has been shewn by *Dyon. Petavius*, *Steph. Curcellæus*, Dr. *Cudworth*, and others. Our Author had read the Fathers upon this Head with a mind full of Prejudice, as it is very common for Persons to do; and with little care, as appears by the choice of places which he produces. I should not think it safe to cite *Clemens* upon the Authority of St. *Basil*, because he might have taken the alledged words out of an Apocryphal and suppositious writing of *Clemens*, of which kind there were a great many of old, and are some still at this day. For it is notorious that the Antients, neglecting all the rules of Criticks, often confounded suppositious Writings with genuin. And our Author imitates them, whilst he alledges Passages out of the manifestly spurious Writings of *Justin Martyr*, as his, or at least as if they were of some moment; for why otherwise did he produce them? Of the rest I have nothing to say, but that Dr. *Hammond* could not stand by the Faith of the Fathers which he cites; who, to speak the truth, were Tritheists rather than assertors of the

present

preſent Opinion. For they believed *the unity of Subſtance*, not *the ſingularity of number*, as *Tertullian* ſpeaks, that is, that the ſubſtance of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt was ſpecifically one, but numerically three; as the learned Men, I before mention'd, have clearly ſhewn, and might much more largely be demonſtrated. Thoſe that do not think fit to anathematize the Fathers, ought alſo to be charitable to other erroneous perſons, for a great many reaſons, to every one obvious. Beſides, whoever conſiders theſe things ſeriouſly, will not be ſo apt to boaſt of the conſent of Antiquity, or complain ſo loudly of Hereticks as Dr. *Hammond* here does; who, I believe, acted therein ſincerely, but without due conſideration, and not very much like a Chriſtian, which I do not ſpeak out of a cenſorious Humor, but only by way of Admonition. Chapter V.

Verſ. 16. *Note* c. I. I rather think that ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον is a Metaphor taken from Diſeaſes, which are ſaid to be πρὸς θάνατον, when they are mortal; as appears from *John* xi. 4. I wonder Dr. *Hammond* ſets down St. *John*'s words, as if he had ſaid ΕΙΣ θάνατον, when all Copies have πρὸς. Did not that falſe reading induce him to ſeek here for Excommunication?

II. I don't know why our Author makes mention here of the Prayers of the Church, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of this matter ſo, as to mention nothing about the Church or its Governors. The *Power of the Keys*, which was too much in the *Doctor*'s thoughts, made him look for thoſe things which belong to it, even where there is no footſtep of them.

Verſ. 21. Ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων.] Our Author in the Margin of the Engliſh Tranſlation, remarks that the *Alexandrian* Copy adds τῶν, which the *Vulgar* Interpreter alſo read. And indeed if it be omitted, it muſt be underſtood. See *Grotius* on this place.

Verſ. 21. *Note* d. But I don't know why the Idols of the Heathens themſelves may not here be underſtood, whoſe Worſhip the Chriſtians were no leſs obliged to beware of, than the Idolatry of the *Simonians*. Nay, there was a much greater care neceſſary to be taken, in order to keep themſelves from the worſhip of the Heathens, becauſe Heathens had the government of the World, and compelled the Chriſtians by Torments to join with them in their Idolatry; whereas the followers of *Simon* had no Authority either in the Roman Empire, or elſewhere.

ANNO-

ANNOTATION

ON THE

Second Epiſtle of St. *John*.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I Wiſh our Author had given us better reaſons for thinking that ſome of the Primitive Chriſtian Churches had a twofold Biſhop, one a *Jew*, and the other a *Gentile*. For I can ſee a great many Objections, to which that ſuppoſition is liable, and which I do not underſtand how he could have ſatisfactorily anſwered. There might that alſo be ſaid againſt the Notion he affixes to κυρία, which would be ſufficient to overthrow it, but which for brevity ſake I paſs by. I rather think the Apoſtle here addreſſed himſelf to ſome *Chriſtian Matron*, whoſe name, for the reaſon mention'd by Dr. *Hammond*, he concealed. It's known that the word *Elect* is often uſed to ſignify all Chriſtians, as *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* have ſeveral times proved.

ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

Epiſtle of St. *Jude*.

Verſ. 4. *Note* a. I Had rather underſtand προγεγραμμένοι according to the common uſe of the Preposition πρὸ in Compoſition, for *before*; for προγράφειν alſo does not ſeem ſo much to ſignify, if we urge the proper Notion of the word, that which is *ſet forth*, as that which was *before written*, but with a deſign that afterwards it may be publickly ſet forth to be read. For an Edict, or an Advertiſement, was firſt written on Paper or a Board, before it was expoſed to be read publickly, and to that end fixed up in ſome open

open place. So likewiſe in *Gal.* iii. 1. I chuſe to render προεγράφη, *hath been before delineated*, rather than *ſet forth*. St. *Jude* here alludes to Laws, which προγράφουσι puniſhments to Malefactors, as a means to deter Men from tranſgreſſing. His meaning is that ſuch Men as he ſpeaks of, were already expreſly condemned by the divine Laws, becauſe Puniſhments were clearly *preſcribed* to their Crimes. So that I do not think there is a reſpect here had to any prediction of Chriſt.

II. I don't ſee the neceſſity of interpreting what St. *Jude* here ſays of none but the Followers of *Simon*, when we may very well underſtand him of any wicked Men whatſoever, who had joined themſelves to the Chriſtians, both *Jews* and others, ſuch as afterwards was that *Peregrinus*, ſpoken of by *Lucian*. For the great Charity of the Chriſtians, who ſuffer'd none that joined with them in their Worſhip, to want neceſſaries; and their frequent ἀγάπαις *Love-feaſts* drew to them not only thoſe that were good, but alſo many wicked Men. If Dr. *Hammond* will call theſe *Gnoſticks*, I ſhall not be againſt it, becauſe I won't contend about a name; but wonder from what credible Author he came to underſtand, that all the bad Chriſtians of thoſe times eſpouſed the opinions of *Simon Magus*.

III. He thinks that κρῖμα here ſignifies the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, which that it may be true, he muſt ſuppoſe that this Epiſtle of St. *Jude* was directed only to the Chriſtians of *Judæa*; for theſe alone were deſtroyed with the *Jews*, who had joined themſelves with them in taking up Arms againſt the *Romans*. But I ſee no ſign in this Epiſtle, by which it may appear that it was written to the Chriſtians of *Judæa*, rather than to others. And then if it be not evident that in this Verſe *Condemnation* ſignifies the deſtruction of the *Jews*, it will not be certain that the *common Salvation*, ſpoken of in the Verſe before, is the deliverance of the Chriſtians out of the hands of the *Jews*, by whom they were perſecuted. I had rather underſtand, both *Salvation*, of eternal Happineſs, and *Condemnation*, of *everlaſting Puniſhment*, which God was about to inflict upon them. And ſo Men *preſcribed to this Judgment*, are Men condemned by the divine Laws to ſuffer perpetual Miſery, for the Sins which St. *Jude* enumerates.

Ibid. *Note* b. I don't believe the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of a poſitive and open *denying* of the points of Faith mention'd; for how would the Chriſtians have endured in their *Agapæ*, Men who had denied God the Father, or Jeſus to be the Chriſt? He could not be accounted a Chriſtian, that denied thoſe Doctrins. But he means a denying of them before the Heathens, in caſe they were vehemently urged to it; ſo that it was only to avoid Perſecution that they denied themſelves to be

Christians; which they thought they might very lawfully do: They no more believed *Simon*, or the Priests of the Heathens, than they did Christ, nor opposed him any more than others; but, according to the time and place they were in, feigned themselves to believe what it was their Interest to appear to believe.

Vers. 7. *Note* c. But there is another more proper, if, namely, we understand these Punishments of that *Fire*, with which, in St. *Jude*'s time, all the Coast of *Sodom* did still burn; for which reason it is called eternal, because it continued burning for so many Ages. Upon this account the *Sodomites* will be said δείγμα πῦρ, that is, *before set to be an example*, and still so to be. See what I have said about this matter in a *Dissert.* de *subversione Sodomæ*.

Vers. 8. *Note* d. Tho I prefer the Apostles before all the lesser or greater Powers of the Roman Empire, yet I do not think they are here respected, who are no where else called by that name; for as for their being said to be stiled the *glory of Christ* in 2 *Cor.* viii. 23. that is foreign to this place, because it is a quite different thing. Besides, δόξαι being very frequently used among Greek Writers, to signify *Honours* and *Empires*, or Magistrates, it is better to follow here that notion. And so I am apt to think the Apostle has a respect not so much to the *Gnosticks*, as to the *Jews*, who bore the Yoke of the Roman Magistrates very impatiently, and said that it was unlawful for a *Jew* to serve any but God, whom they called *the only Lord and Ruler*. This was the Opinion of the fourth Sect of the *Jews*, founded by *Judas Gaulonita*, of whose followers *Josephus* speaks thus, *Lib.* 18. cap. 2. Antiq. Jud. Τὰ μὲν λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμῃ τῇ φαρισαίων ὁμολογοῦσι, δυσκίνητον δ' τὸ ἐλεύθερον ἔχουσι ἦθος, αὐτοὺς, μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν Θεὸν ὑπειληφότες. Θανάτους δ' ἰδίων ὑπομένειν παρελαγμένους ἐν ὀλίγῳ πάσχουσι, καὶ συγγενῶν πρωείας, καὶ φίλων· διὰ τὸ μηδένα ἀνθρώπων ὀνομάζειν δεσπότην: *in all other things they agree with the* Pharisees, *but they have an unmoveable love for Liberty, thinking that God alone is their Lord and Ruler, and reputing it a small matter to suffer various kinds of Death, and the Punishments of their Kindred and Friends, for refusing to call any man Lord.* This Doctrin was by many greedily embraced, as we are told by *Josephus*, in the beginning of the same Book; and indeed if not openly, at least in their Thoughts it was favoured by most of the *Jews*; and that some such Men as these had joined themselves to the Assemblies of the Christians, is not at all strange.

Vers. 9. *Note* e. I. The words here attributed to *Michael*, being the very same that are found in *Zachar.* iii. 2. it is with reason thought by Dr. *Hammond* in concurrence with other Interpreters, that St. *Jude* alludes to that Vision. And because the Angel there is represented as disputing

disputing with *the Adversary*, about the restoring of the Jewish Commonwealth, it is consequent that the same is here signified by τῶν Μωσέως, *the body of Moses*, in St. *Jude*; which Phrase St. *Jude* took from the use of the Apostles, who ordinarily call Christians *the body of Christ*.

II. But what Dr. *Hammond* says afterwards of the Magistracy of the Devil, whose Dignity the good Angel reverenced, even in an evil Spirit, tho *Grotius* and others say the same, that I confess I cannot digest. For it's true, among Men, not only Subjects honourably bespeak their Rulers, but Princes also themselves shew a mutual respect to each other; the Law of Nations requiring it should be so, for many weighty reasons between Nations enjoying an equal Power, lest they should be at perpetual variance among themselves, constituted, like the Civil Law among Citizens. But there seems to be no such Law between good and bad Angels, who are irreconcilable Enemies; the bad having rebelled against their common Lord, by whom *being put in Chains they are reserved unto the Judgment of the great Day*. So that the δόξας, which the Angel would not rail at, are some others; nor does *Satan* signify the Prince of the Devils. If we consult the History of the times, to which the Vision seen by *Zachariah* refers, we shall find that the Governors of *Persia*, who had the oversight of the Provinces situated on the West of *Euphrates*, vehemently opposed the design of *Joshua* about restoring the Temple. And of these the chief were the *Thatthenai* and *Schethar-boznai*, whose Enterprises and Calumnies are recorded in *Esdr.* Chap. v. Now these things were represented to *Zachary* the Prophet in a Vision, by which he understood that the *Jews* had indeed powerful Enemies with the King of *Persia*, but that God by the Ministry of his Angels render'd their Calumnies and Attempts ineffectual. So that *Satan* are the *Thatthenai* and *Schethar-boznai*, and other Adversaries of the *Jews*, that were represented to the Prophet under the person of one Accuser. So in *Psalm* cix. 5. *Satan standing at* his *Right hand* is manifestly an Accuser, and that word often signifies any Adversary who endeavours to frustrate any ones designs. The same is meant by the word διάβολος, which is used by the *Septuagint*; for διαβάλλεσθαι is as well *to resist* (adversari) as *to calumniate*. And the same Persons that are called *Satan* in the Prophet *Zachary*, and here the *Devil*, were δόξαι, or Magistrates sent from *Persia*, to rule over *Syria*, and other Countries on the West side of *Euphrates*, subject to the King of *Persia*; for which reason the same that are signified in this Verse by the word διάβολος, are in the foregoing and St. *Peter*, stiled δόξαι. And in the disputation of the Angel with those Men, men-

tion'd in *Zechariah*, the Angel being repreſented as modeſtly rebuking the enemies of the *Jews*, the *Perſian* Rulers, becauſe of their Dignity; hence St. *Peter* and St. *Jude* with great reaſon infer that the *Jews* did very ill in reviling the Roman Governors, who ſtood at that time in the ſame relation to the *Jews*, as formerly the *Perſians*. This interpretation ſeems to me much more natural and agreable to Hiſtory and things themſelves, than any other; and I doubt not but the *Jews* in the Apoſtles times did ſo interpret the place in *Zachariah*.

Verſ. 10. Ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν.] I do by no means think that the Apoſtle here has a reſpect to Angels, but to general Notions, concerning the neceſſity of the diſtinction of Men into Magiſtrates and Subjects, and about the neceſſity of obeying thoſe whom the divine Providence has ſet over us, tho they do not always behave themſelves as they ought; leſt Wars ſhould enſue, which are much more pernicious than that obedience.

Ibid. Φυσικῶς.] That is, without a Maſter. See my Note on 1 *Cor.* xi. 14.

Verſ. 11. *Note* f. I ſhould render the words; *effuſi ſunt errore Balaami, mercedis cauſa, Were poured out in the error of* Balaam, *for Reward*; which perfectly agrees with the place in St. *Peter*, which is undoubtedly parallel to this, not *Rom.* i. 27. but in the harſh Conjecture of Dr. *Hammond*. Ἐξεχύθησαν ἐν πλάνῃ is exactly the ſame with ἐπλανήθησαν; for ἐκχυθῆναι, where the Diſcourſe is about Men, ſignifies to be ſpread abroad, or wander, by a Metaphor taken from Liquor poured out. So *Judith* Chap. xv. 2. about the flight of the *Aſſyrians*, which the *Jews* purſued, ſome running one way, and ſome another: *and there was not a Man which ſtayed before the face of his Neighbour, but* ἐκχυθέντες *being poured out, they fled every way* —— *and then the Children of* Iſrael, *every warlike Man among them,* ἐξεχύθησαν *were poured out upon them.* This is what was meant by *Heſychius* and *Phavorinus*, when they interpreted this word by ἠφανίσθησαν, becauſe they that thus fly away, run out of others ſight; nor muſt any thing be alter'd in *Phavorinus*, of whom we have no Manuſcript Copies, becauſe he himſelf firſt printed his own Lexicon in the time of *Leo* X. Our Author ſeems to have thought that he wrote before Printing was found out: But in *Heſychius* we muſt read ἠφανίσθησαν.

Verſ. 12. *Note* g. I prefer the latter interpretation, ſo as to think, it is not a Tempeſt, called φθινοπωρον, but the ſignification of the word that is here referred to, which comes from φθίνειν τὸν ὀπωρον, *to corrupt Fruit*, as it is in the *Etymologicon Magnum*; becauſe tho, towards the end of the φθινοπωρου Trees are deſtitute of Leaves and Fruit, yet principally

principally during that Seaſon, the fruit of Trees ripen and are gather'd.

Verſ. 16. *Note* i. I. I acknowledg that the Phraſe here uſed by St. *Jude*, is taken from *Daniel*, but it does not therefore follow it muſt be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe; for what is more common either among Jewiſh or Chriſtian Writers, than to take Phraſes out of the Scripture, tho not to be underſtood juſt in the ſame ſenſe? It is ſufficient if they can but with ſome fitneſs be applied to thoſe things which are ſpoken of. Beſides, when the whole place is not alledged, no body will ſay that the whole place is referred to, unleſs the thing require it.

II. Therefore by *great ſwelling words*, I am apt to think is meant the boaſtings of the wicked *Jews*, who pretended to defend the Cauſe of God, againſt the Tyranny of the *Romans*; and promiſed their Aſſociates Victory, and declared that they could not be ſubject to any. To theſe Men, and not to the *Gnoſticks*, St. *Paul* ſeems to have had a reſpect in 2 *Theſſ.* ii. as I have ſhewn at large, againſt Dr. *Hammond*, on that place. I have ſhewn alſo on *Rom.* viii. 20. that ματαιότης does not ſignify Idolatry.

Verſ. 22. *Note* m. διακρινόμενοι is a Participle of the Paſſive, and not of the Middle Voice, and muſt be rendred *making a difference*; namely according to mens Diſpoſitions and Offences. For ſome muſt be dealt with more tenderly, and others more ſeverely, as Dr. *Hammond* obſerves: See what *Pricæus* has collected on this place, and my Note on *James* ii. 4.

ANNO

ANNOTATIONS ON THE Revelation of St. *John* the Divine.

AT the end of the *Premon.*] Tho I think Dr. *Hammond*'s Interpretation of the *Apocalypse*, may as eaſily be defended as any other; yet ſome things he ſays here which ſeem to need correction, and which I ſhall briefly take notice of.

I. He repreſents to us the Chriſtians of *Aſia Minor*, as being as much afraid of the *Jews* and *Gnoſticks*, as if they had ſent Proconſuls into *Aſia*; or at leaſt the Roman Magiſtrates were ſo entirely in their Intereſt, that the leaſt complaint they made of them would be pernicious to the Chriſtians. For unleſs this be true, the Chriſtians would have had no reaſon to be ſo much afraid of the *Jews*, or to think they were delivered from Perſecution by the Calamities of that People. But that the *Jews* had ſo much Power, or were in ſo great favour with the *Roman* Magiſtrates, that at their inſtigation they dealt cruelly with the Chriſtians, does not appear by any Hiſtory. We find indeed in the *Acts* that the *Jews* exaſperated the Heathens as much as they could, and raiſed Seditions, and went to the Magiſtrates to accuſe the Chriſtians; but we find alſo that they were but derided by them: ſee *Acts* xviii. 12. & *ſeqq.* The Chriſtians that lived in *Aſia Minor* had moſt reaſon to fear the Statuaries, Painters, Prieſts, and other Men who made a gain of Idolatry, and any ſuperſtitious Perſons whatſoever; but not the *Jews*, who were as much hated by them as the Chriſtians: ſee the Story of the Tumult at *Epheſus*, which is in *Acts* xix. So that what is foretold of the deſtruction of the *Jews*, belongs primarily to them that lived in *Judea* and the neighbouring Countries, who were really to be delivered from the Perſecutions of the *Jews*; and ſecondarily alſo to others, eſpecially thoſe which had gone over from Judaiſm to the Chriſtian Religion, and who would be glad to ſee the Prophecies of Chriſt and the Apoſtles fulfilled, and be confirmed in their Faith by that means.

II. I don't know why our Author thought the Edict of *Claudius*, about expelling the Christians or Jews out of *Rome*, reached as far as *Ephesus*. For they that were only expelled out of *Rome*, were not forced to go out of other Cities of the *Roman* Empire, unless it was so order'd in the Edict. By the word *Rome*, no body ever understood the rest of the Cities of the Roman Empire: see Interpreters on the place in *Suetonius*, and on *Acts* xviii. 2. If therefore St. *John* was banished at that time, and transported from *Ephesus* to *Patmos*, it was not because of the Edict of *Claudius*, but for some other reason. But the Chronology of those times, the accounts of which are not taken out of the Writings of the Apostles, is very uncertain. Chapter I.

III. Our Author does not speak accurately, where he says that *Domitian* was Governor of *Rome*, *whilst* Vespasian *was in* Judæa; he should have added, either in *Egypt*, or *whilst he was upon his Journey*; for *Vespasian* did not stay long in *Judæa*, after he was saluted Emperor.

IV. There being nothing not only more uncertain, but even more false, than the Menology of the *Greeks*, and the Martyrology of the *Romans*, as those learned Men who have touched upon them have shewn: I don't see what made Dr. *Hammond* scruple to disparage their Authority. This I am sure would have been much better than to wrest every thing, that he might not seem to contradict them, as to the time when *Antipas* suffer'd Martyrdom. But I shall say something of that on *Chap.* ii. 12.

V. What he says here of the sudden destruction of the *Gnosticks*, is false, as I have shewn on 2 *Thess.* ii. 8.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 4. *Note* a. I. THERE is no doubt but *Asia* here signifies the *Proconsular Asia*. But according to the Roman Custom, the Neighbouring Cities no otherwise depended upon a *Metropolis*, than as they resorted to it, when a Roman Magistrate sat in Judgment; for they were not governed by Provincial Magistrates of Corporations. Which being so, I cannot see why the Bishops of these Cities are supposed to have ruled over them with a Metropolitan Power; not to say it is very uncertain whether there was in the beginning any Hierarchy constituted, according to the pattern of a Civil Government. For what later Writers say of that Age, is not sufficiently certain; because they speak of it in the words of their own times, and call those *Metropolitans* and *Archbishops*, which were stiled simply Bishops. Such a way of speaking is deceitful, and may be

Chapter I. be apt to perſwade the unwary, that not only theſe Names, but alſo the Power that was joined with them in the following Ages, were known in the Apoſtles times. I had rather our Author, in his Paraphraſe of the New Teſtament, had abſtained from them.

II. Dr. *Hammond* had not look'd into the *Digg.* Lib. 1. *Tit.* xvi. *Leg.* 4. S. 5. where *Ulpian* does not ſpeak himſelf, but alledges the words of *Antoninus*, and ſomewhat alſo otherwiſe: *Our Emperor* Antoninus Auguſtus, *at the deſire of the* Aſians, *wrote back*, that a Proconſul was obliged to go by Sea to *Aſia*, ἢ τ μητροπόλεων Ἐφεσον, that is, *and among the mother Cities to touch firſt at* Epheſus. The place alſo in *Pliny* is falſe quoted out of *Lib.* vi. inſtead of *Lib.* v.

Verſ. 6. *Note* d. I. I wiſh Dr. *Hammond* had alledged ſome Edict of the Roman Emperors or Magiſtrates obtained by the *Jews*, whereby the Chriſtians were forbidden to meet together, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*; for I do not remember that I ever read any in Eccleſiaſtical Writers, or others: which yet if it be uncertain, or falſe, as I verily think, ſome of thoſe things which he ſays in the foregoing Annotation muſt needs be falſe, or at leaſt uncertain. And from the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, to the reign of *Adrian*, the *Jews* were too odious upon the account of their Seditions, to prevail with the *Roman* Emperors or Magiſtrates to perſecute the Chriſtians, as our Author well proves in what follows.

II. That Dr. *Hammond* might ſhew that the Chriſtians *reigned*, as he ſpeaks, after all the hopes and power of the *Jews* were taken away, he is forced to extenuate thoſe ten noted Perſecutions; which it's certain ſome of the Antients too much aggravated, as has been ſolidly proved by Mr. *Dodwell* in his *Diſſert.* de *Paucitate Martyrum*. But tho I do not deny but that in the fourth and following Ages, the number of Martyrs was very much encreaſed; yet I do not ſee how the condition of the Chriſtian Church, in the ſecond and third Centuries, could be repreſented under the ſimilitude of a *Kingdom*, unleſs that *Kingdom* be very faintly underſtood. I had rather this had been referred to later times.

Verſ. 10. Ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ] This day, which in the words of *Andreas Cæſarienſis*, alledged by our Author in the Margin of his Paraphraſe, is ἡ τ ἀναστάσεως Χριστῦ μνημόσυνον φέρουσα, *Barnabas* in *Ep. Cathol.* cap. xv. calls the *eighth*. For after he had ſaid, that the ſix days of the Week ſignify ſix thouſand Years, during which the World was to continue, and the ſeventh the laſt thouſand, in which God would put an end to it, he ſpeaks thus: Ὁρᾶτε πῶς λέγει· ἡ πρὸ τῶν σαββάτων ἐμοὶ δικπά· ἀλλ' ἃ ἐποίησα, ἐν ᾧ κατα παύσας τὰ πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀγδόης ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν ἄλλα κόσμα ἀρχὴν

ἀγχίνοιαν: *mind how he ſpeaks: The preſent Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but thoſe which I have made, when putting an end to all things, I ſhall begin the eighth day, that is, another World.* Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέτειλεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς: *Wherefore alſo we ſpend the eighth day in expreſſions of Joy, in which Jeſus both aroſe from the Dead, and having ſhewn himſelf aſcended into Heaven.* Chapter 1.

Verſ. 11. Ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος.] That is, before whom no Man ever was that which I am, nor ever ſhall be; who neither had any Predeceſſor, nor ſhall have any to ſucceed me. This is a Phraſe taken out of *Iſa.* xli. 4. where it is uſed of God the Father. It is explained in the ſame Prophet, *Chap.* xliii. 10. in theſe words: *before me there was no God formed, neither ſhall there be after me*; and *Chap.* xliv. 6. *I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God.* God ſeems to have had a reſpect to the Opinion of the Heathens, who feigned Succeſſions of Gods, of which ſome came and dethroned others, and reigned in their ſtead, and which ſeems to have prevailed among the Eaſtern Nations, as it did among the *Greeks*, whoſe ſentiments are thus expreſſed by *Prometheus*, in *Æſchylus*:

Διοῦς δὲ τυράννους ὀπτεύοντας μ' ἐδέμλω,
Τρίτον δὴ καὶ τὸν νῦν τυραννοῦντ' ὄψομαι
Λύσσα καὶ τάχος.

Which *Grotius* thus interprets:

——————*Annon hos duos*
Ego ipſe conſpexi evolutos arcibus?
Brevi videbo tertium, & fœde quidem,
Et derepente.

Verſ. 20. *Note* h. It were to be wiſhed that our Author had reconciled what he ſays here of ſingle Biſhops, in the Churches of *Aſia*, with that which he elſewhere ſays of a twofold Biſhop; of which one was ſet over the *Jewiſh*, and another the *Gentile* Chriſtians: ſee his *Premonition* to the 2*d* Epiſtle of St. *John*. Did he think that theſe Epiſtles were written only to the Aſſemblies of the Circumciſed?

CHAP. II.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. IT is not neceſſary we ſhould know who theſe Impoſtors were of which St. *John* ſpeaks, there being ſo many other things in antient Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of much greater moment as the Travels and Martyrdoms of moſt of the Apoſtles, altogether unknown to us; either becauſe none committed them to writing, or becauſe the Records of them are loſt. And therefore I had rather confeſs my ignorance in this matter, than violently bring in here the *Gnoſticks*. I might with more probability ſay that the Apoſtle has a reſpect to ſome Jewiſh Deceivers, who boaſted that they had been familiar with Chriſt, and therefore *ſaid that they were Apoſtles*. It is not certain that *Cerinthus* called himſelf an *Apoſtle*, or pretended to have received what he aſſerted from *a great Apoſtle*. It is ſaid indeed by *Gaius* in *Euſebius* Lib. iii. cap. 28. that *Cerinthus* propoſed his Doctrins δι' ἀποκαλύψεων, ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, *by revelations, as written by a great Apoſtle*. But this may be only the Judgment of *Gaius*, and not *Cerinthus* his own words.

Verſ. 4. *Note* b. I. What our Author here ſays about *Elxai*, out of *Euſebius*, ſhews that ſome of the Jews (for *Elxai* was a Jew) were poſſeſſed with an Opinion, before the Apoſtles time, that it was lawful to diſſemble their Religion, yea to renounce it, to avoid Perſecution. So that whenever that Doctrine is oppoſed by the Apoſtles, we need not preſently think they have a reſpect to the *Gnoſticks*, the Followers of *Simon Magus*, as our Author often inculcates, not without tiring his Reader.

II. Our Author ſeems to have thought that *Elxai* was a Chriſtian Heretick, but he was rather an *Eſſene*, which was the name of a Jewiſh Sect, as we are told by *Epiphanius*, and took a great many more things from Judaiſm than from Chriſtianity. Dr. *Hammond*, whilſt he makes him to be a Chriſtian, changes the words of *Epiphanius*; for inſtead of that which he calls, *to worſhip Idols*, ἀλλὰ μετανοῆσαι, he writes in Engliſh *to abjure the faith*; and adds, as out of the ſame Author: *From theſe came the Helkeſaitæ*, &c. Which I could not in find him, nor do I believe they are *Epiphanius* his words.

Verſ. 13. *Note* i. I do not commend Mr. *Brightman*, but I wonder Dr. *Hammond* ſhould ſo eaſily aſſent to the *Menology*, which *Grotius* has ſhewn to be unfit to be here credited.

Verſ. 26. *Note* o. I. I have ſhewn on 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 3. that it is erroneouſly thought that *Simon* was look'd upon as a God by the *Romans*. I have alledged

alledged also on the same place, a passage out of *Eusebius*, in which he affirms that the followers of *Simon* were alive in his time. And that we ought to believe him rather than any other, the thing it self shews, seeing the *Valentinians*, and other *Gnosticks* flourished under the *Antonini* and afterward, as we are told by the same *Eusebius* out of *Irenæus*, *Hist. Eccleſiast.* lib. iv. cap. 2. Chapter III.

II. It is not necessary that the name *Jezabel* should be thought to signify any Sect, whereas it might be the name of some Woman that took upon her the title of a Propheteſs at *Thyatira*. Considering the great scarcity of Records of that Age, is is no wonder there are many things which we cannot understand in such kind of allusions.

CHAP. III.

Vers. 14. *Note* a, c. IS there then any difference between μεγαλωσύνη and μέγας μέγιστος; none certainly. But these are the false and vain subtilties of I know not whom, which our Author collected on this Chapter that he might not seem too short. See the verses about *Antipas* alledged by him on *chap.* ii. 13, in which a Bishop is called καλλιμέγιστος.

Vers. 15. *Note* d. I. Tho the *Gnosticks* might justly be charged with lukewarmness and pride, if they were such as the Antients describe them; yet we must not therefore think that all the primitive Christians that were guilty of those vices were the Disciples of the *Gnosticks*. I am sorry our Author should recur to those Hereticks without any certain marks of their being here referred to.

II. Lukewarmness here is not the opposite *to gold tryed in the fire*, or a *white garment*, but to poverty which the *Laodiceans* are upbraided with in the verse immediately foregoing. But our Author, who never took any care to speak properly, confounds every thing.

Vers. 20. Καὶ δειπνήσω μετ' αὐτοῦ.] That is, as he entertains me at his house and table when I knock at his door, so I will receive him when he comes to me. Otherwise it would be an idle *tautology*, if these words were understood of the same Supper; for if we sup with any one, he cannot but sup with us. But he is said to sup with us, whom we entertain; and we to sup with him that entertains us. The meaning of this figurative Expression is, that if any one in this life, with that sincerity which he ought, embraces the Christian Religion, he shall be received by Christ into the Mansions of eternal Happiness. Our Author did not understand this place.

CHAP. IV.

Verſ. 2. Διὰ σφίγγ., &c.] This Viſion, as almoſt all the reſt, has many things in it reſembling the Viſions of the Prophets of the Old Teſtament; and the Apoſtle often uſes Words and Phraſes borrowed from them: for the manner of God's revealing himſelf to men, was, to uſe Phraſes to which they were accuſtomed, rather than any other. And ſo becauſe the Chriſtians were uſed to the reading of the Old Teſtament, God deſcribes future things under the New by the ſame Images and Expreſſions by which he had repreſented them to the antient Prophets. This every one muſt have in his eye that undertakes to explain theſe Prophecies, that by the accompliſhment of the antient Predictions he may judg of the New; which if he does not, he will be apt to fall into very great miſtakes. For inſtance, we read this Prophecy in *Joel* ii. 30, 31. *I will ſhew wonders in the heavens above, and wonders in the earth beneath, blood and fire, and vapour of ſmoke. The Sun ſhall be turned into darkneſs, and the Moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.* Whoever ſhould underſtand theſe words properly, and according to the preſent way of ſpeaking, would be mightily deceived, and ready to think that they were yet to be fulfilled. But St. *Peter*, in *Acts* ii. has told us, that they are to be underſtood figuratively, of a ſpiritual change which the Goſpel was to make in the earth. And ſo when we read the like in this Book, we muſt have a care of thinking that the changes which are deſcribed as future, both in Heaven and Earth, before ſome things here foretold came to paſs, were really and literally to be accompliſhed.

Ibid. *Note* b. If it were certain that the privileges of Metropolitans were known in that age, that the Apoſtles ſat in a lower place than the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and the Chriſtians at that time were as obſervant of that external order, as they were afterwards; Dr. *Hammond*'s conjecture might be born. But now to ſpeak in the ſofteſt terms, all thoſe things being uncertain, it will not eaſily be believed by judicious perſons, that St. *John* here alludes to the Church of *Jeruſalem*, rather than any other Aſſembly.

Verſ. 4. *Note* c. The Sanhedrim of the Jews ſat in the form of a half circle, as is largely ſhewn by Mr. *Selden* de *Synedriis*, lib. ii. c. 6. and the Head of the Council in the middle ſeat. And hence I rather think that the form of the heavenly Council repreſented to St. *John* was taken, both becauſe the Sanhedrim was an Aſſembly of Judges,

and

and becauſe it is not certain that in the Apoſtles times Chriſtians meeting together ſecretly and in a private houſe, did ſo carefully obſerve that order in ſitting. Our Author often takes it for undoubted that the cuſtoms of the ſecond or third Century, or alſo later Ages were Apoſtolical, which he ought not to have done: Of the Epiſcopal ſeat in Churches, ſee *Beveridge* his Notes on *Can.* xi. of the firſt *Nicene Council.* Chapter IV.

Ibid. *Note* d. I. Our Author before [in Note on v. 2.] rejected their opinion, who thought this Image of a Court preſented to St. *John*, was taken from the Great *Sanhedrim*, becauſe the number was not in both the ſame, and it is ſtrange he was not afraid leſt it ſhould be objected to him, that it was altogether as unallowable to feign a certain number of Biſhops, without the authority of antient Records. But tho this Image be ſaid to be taken from the Great Sanhedrim, it is not neceſſary there ſhould be a perfect ſimilitude between them. But, you will ſay, why are there only four and twenty, and not lxxii here repreſented as ſitting in Council? If I ſhould ſay I don't know, Dr. *Hammond*'s conjecture will not be therefore at all more probable. But it may be ſaid, that to deſcribe this Court, four and twenty Heads of the prieſtly Order were choſen out of the Sanhedrim, becauſe they were in a ſpecial manner conſecrated to God; beſides that the Prieſts only were of divine inſtitution, not the reſt of the members of the Sanhedrim.

II. The High Prieſts of the Jews cannot be ſaid to have worn *golden Mitres*, becauſe they were made of linen, and had no gold belonging to them, but only a thin plate hanging over the Forehead. See my Note on *Exod.* xxviii. 4. Much leſs do I think there is any reſpect here had to the Mitres of Biſhops, which I no more imagin to have been in that age than the reſt of the ornaments at this day uſed by them. They had the thing then without the Ornaments; and now we have the Ornaments without the thing.

Verſ. 5. *Note* e. I ſee here nothing that looks like a reſpect to the Deacons of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, unleſs it be the number of ſeven; which ſeems rather to be taken from the number of Lamps uſed in the Sanctuary, and that was otherwiſe common in holy Solemnities among the Jews and other Nations. See my Notes on *Exod.* xxix. 29. and *Levit.* xiv. 7.

Verſ. 6. *Note* f. I. It is a miſtake that ἐν μέσῳ ſignifies *in the former part*, becauſe where the diſcourſe is about men, *to be in the midſt of them*, is all one as *to be before them*. The places in the *Acts* are in vain alledged, for in them it is not properly the middle part or centre that is

Chapter IV. is signified by the words ἐν μέσῳ, nor properly the former or hinder part; but ἐν μέσῳ is simply *before the rest*, or *among the rest*, in *Acts* i. 15. and iv. 7. for in the other places those words are not found. So that ἐν κύκλῳ here will not signify *behind*.

II. The Interpreter our Author confutes is *H. Grotius*, who interprets ἐν μέσῳ θρόνου properly over against the midst of the Throne, placing one living Creature upon the steps before the Throne, and another behind; which is much more probable, because he takes ἐν κύκλῳ here, as κύκλοθεν is taken in *vers.* 4. according to Dr. *Hammond*'s own Opinion. Yet I had rather place two living Creatures before the Throne, not on the Steps, but even with the ground, over against the middle of the Throne, and two on the sides; for this reason, because afterwards, in *Chap.* v. 6. it is said, that *a Lamb stood in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the Elders*; by which it appears that there was some space between the Throne and the living Creatures. From this place our Author disputes indeed against *Grotius*, but so, as it appears that he did not know what himself meant.

Ibid. *Note* g. I. He that sits upon the Throne is represented as much greater than the four living Creatures, as being God himself, whom the living Creatures praise and worship, which are undoubtedly the Angels. I am apt to think, if it were to be enquired, who resembled them in the Sanhedrim; the only persons that can be likened to them are the Officers that waited upon the Sanhedrim. But between these Ministers of God and the Ministers of the Sanhedrim, there was almost as much difference as between God and the Prince of the Sanhedrim; and therefore there is no similitude to be sought for between them, but in this, that they might both be called Ministers.

II. This is much more likely than what is said by our Author, who, to find out his own meaning, makes Apostles inferior to a Bishop, which is utterly false: for the Apostles having received their Commission from Christ himself, had an equal Authority over all Nations, and in all Cities; and therefore wherever they were, had the privilege of the first Seats, if any order was to be observed in sitting. And they ought not to yield to the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, whom they themselves had ordained. What *Clemens Alexandrinus* says of the Bishoprick of *Jerusalem*, just as if the Apostles out of modesty had not aspired to it, is, with that learned Writer's leave, not agreeable to things themselves. It was not lawful for the Apostles to take upon them the Bishoprick of any one City, because they

they were to ſpread the Goſpel through the whole World, according to the Command of Chriſt; nor could they, without diſparaging themſelves, ſeek a Dignity leſs than their own. Yet our Author ſeveral times alledges theſe inconſiderate words of *Clemens*, as if they were of ſome moment. But you will ſay, St. *James* having heard the reſt, at length in *Acts* xv. ſums up the Judgment of the Council, after all were agreed, which is the Office of a Preſident. But it does not therefore follow that he did that as Preſident, and ſo as a thing which of right belonged to him; but rather by the impulſe of the Holy Spirit, who might have pronounced that Decree by the mouth of any that were there preſent. Thoſe holy men were not ambitious of the φιλοπρωτίαι or φιλοπροεδρίαι like the Phariſees; and therefore among Friends, and thoſe acted by the ſame Spirit, every thing doubtleſs was done without ſtanding upon Order or Ceremonies, the effects of mens Pride and Contention. Nor do I any more think that St. *James* here acted as a Preſident, than that he ſat on a high Throne, with ſome four Apoſtles attending on him as *Metropolitan* and *Archbiſhop*, as our Author calls him, and the Biſhops of *Judea* ſitting round about: which yet muſt have been done, if this repreſentation of the heavenly Court was taken from thence; otherwiſe it has no more reſemblance with the Council of *Jeruſalem* than with any other Conſiſtory of Judges. Chapter IV.

III. The Objection our Author propoſes to himſelf is of no moment, and might have been ſolved in one word, from what he ſays towards the end of his ſecond Anſwer: for it is viſible, that the *Antiochians* ſent to enquire at *Jeruſalem*, becauſe there were there a great many Apoſtles, and other Diſciples, who had converſed with Chriſt on earth, and had received ſpiritual gifts from him from Heaven; who if they had been in the moſt obſcure Village in all *Judea*, would nevertheleſs have been there conſulted. They had no reſpect therefore to the Metropolitan Dignity of the City, which our Author here, without reaſon, makes a ſhew of, and which was a piece of Grandure not known in thoſe times. Of after Ages I ſay nothing, in which it was lawful for Biſhops to enter, as it were, into Covenant with one another, and attribute a greater dignity to ſome ſeats than to others; which Conſtitution ſeemed uſeful, and ought not to be changed where it has obtain'd, becauſe it may be beneficial to the ordinary ſort of Chriſtians.

Verſ. 7. *Note* h. I. Theſe things are not only Conjectures, but moſt extravagant Fancies, in which I wonder our learned Author could acquieſce. There is not here ſo much as the leaſt indication

of

Chapter V. of the Standards or Standard-bearers of *Israel*; nor any ground to imagin them alluded to, besides that which is said by the *Rabbins*, who are less acquainted with what was done of old than we, and whose inventions are justly said by our Author to be absurd. But why then did he believe them? I confess I don't understand.

II. On the contrary, here is a manifest allusion to the Cherubims, who are the Ministers of God, not God himself. And so it is they which are describ'd, and not God; of whom see what I have said on *Exod.* xxv. 18. They are the Officers and Ministers of God in executing his Judgments, which best of all agree to this place; and not Apostles, whose Office was not to punish obstinate Offenders. What our Author here says out of *Eusebius*, and about some particular Apostles, is as absurd as the fictions of the *Rabbins*.

Vers. 8. *Note* i. But if we understand the Attendants of God to be signified by those living Creatures, which seems to be more probable; those Eyes will denote the watchfulness of the Angels, in guarding those whom God commits to their care. Such another Image presented it self to the fancies of the Poets, when they described *Argus*, as set by *Juno* to watch her Rival:

Centum luminibus cinctum caput Argus habebat, &c.

which may be read in *Ovid.* Metam. Lib. 1.

CHAP. V.

Vers. 1. *Note* b. *Scriptus & in tergo*, makes nothing to the length of the Roll, which tho short, might be written on the back-side; but to the abundance of matter contained in it, which was so much that it could not be all written on the foreside of the Parchment; as the *Orestes* of a certain unknown Poet, mention'd by *Juvenal*, *Sat.* 1. 5.

Summi plena jam margine libri,
Scriptus & in tergo, nec dum finitus Orestes.

Vers. 8. *Note* c. It is indeed the Office of Bishops to offer Prayers and Praises to God, in the name of the Churches over which they are set; but this Assembly held as in Heaven, is not a representation of things done on Earth; but as a Celestial Court, to set out which there are some colours taken from earthly things. So that the four and twenty Elders are rather Angels of the highest Dignity, which are as it were God's

God's Ἀρχάγγελοι assistants in this Council; which Angels having the Patronage of the Christian Religion assigned them, it is no wonder if they are said to present the Prayers of Christians to God, and to speak in the name of Christians. An Angel is in like manner represented as performing this Office, afterwards in *Chap.* viii. 3, 4. Chapter VI.

CHAP. VI.

Vers. 2. Καὶ ἐξῆλθε νικῶν, καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ.] That is (the words being inverted) he went out to conquer, and did in effect conquer from his very going out. That which is meant is, that the Coming of Christ, whether to reform Men, or to punish them if they were obstinate, was neither vain, nor casual.

Vers. 4. *Note* a. I. It was worth observing that *Eusebius* makes mention of two Famines, under the reign of *Claudius*, one foretold by *Agabus*, and to be referred to the second year of *Claudius*, tho he mentions it on his fourth; another in *Greece* and at *Rome*, which he refers to the ninth and tenth Years of that Emperor. I know that *Joseph Scaliger* thinks that the latter was foretold by *Agabus*, and refers it to the fifth Year of *Claudius*; but he gives no reason for his Affirmation; expecting, as is common with him, to be believed without proof.

II. *Suetonius* does not expresly say what our Author attributes to him, but only: *Judæos, impulsore Christo, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* The unbelieving *Jews* endeavour'd to raise a Tumult against the Christians, upon the account of Religion, for which reason both the *Jews* and Christians were expelled out of *Rome*. *Suetonius* says that Christ was *impulsor*, *the cause* or *mover* of those Tumults, out of Ignorance, when he should only have said that he was the occasion of them.

III. Whereas our Author affirms, that those who were by the Emperor's Edict expelled out of *Rome*, were expelled also out of the rest of the Cities of the *Roman* Empire, he ought to have proved it, and not have supposed it as certain. But it is false, as every one knows that has read any thing of the Roman History. Of this I have spoken already on the Premonition prefixed to this Book.

Vers. 6. *Note* b. The learned Dr. *Bernard* thinks that the Syrian *Chœnix*, when full of Wheat, weighed something above four English Pounds, and that one of *Tiberius* his *denarii*, current in the time of *John*, was worth a little more than seven English Farthings. By which calculation it appears that Wheat was dear, when four Pounds cost seven Farthings; but that our Author is mistaken, who supposes that

Chapter VI.

a *Chœnix* of Wheat was ſpent by one Man in a day. But I leave theſe things to the examination of thoſe who are curious about ſuch matters.

Verſ. 8. *Note* d. I. Θηρίων cannot ſignify *Cattel*, but only *wild Beaſts*, except improperly: and therefore I prefer the ordinary reading before that of the *Alexandrian* Copy.

II. There are two faults here in the Citations of *Joſephus*; one in the Margin, where Lib. vi. c. 8. *Bell. Jud.* is ſet inſtead of Lib. vi. c. 28. and the other, where *Joſephus de Captiv.* L. vi. c. 44. is cited inſtead of the ſame Book *de Bell. Jud.* Lib. vi. c. 45.

Verſ. 9. *Note* e. I. Our learned Author thought St. *John* here alludes to the *fourth*, as it is called, Book of *Eſdras*, extant only in Latin. But his Publiſhers, knowing this Book to be Apocryphal, cited the ſecond of *Eſdras*, in which there is no ſuch paſſage. [This muſt be in a different Edition from that which I uſe, where *Eſdras* 4. is referred to.] In the Epiſtle of *Barnabas* Chap. xii. there is a place produced out of the ſame Book. But this might alſo be added in *Barnabas* his Epiſtle; and he that wrote the 4*th* Book of *Eſdras*, who ſeems to have been ſome Chriſtian, imitated this place in the *Revelation*.

II. Ψυχαὶ ἐσφαγμένων, *the Souls of them that were ſlain*, may, according to the uſe of the Hebrew Language, which theſe Writers often follow, ſignify their *dead Bodies*; for נֶפֶשׁ *Soul* is frequently taken for a dead Body. But tho the *Soul* is taken for the *Life*, and the Life be in the Blood, it does not therefore follow that in the uſe of Scripture the Blood is ordinarily called the *Soul*. The uſe of words muſt be ſhewn by examples, and not by reaſonings. He might have produced that Paſſage in *Virgil* Æneid. ix. v. 349.

Purpuream vomit ille ANIMAM, *& cum ſanguine miſta*
Vina refert moriens.

But it is better to underſtand by ψυχαὶ here the Souls of Martyrs, which being admitted into the heavenly Sanctuary, did by their Preſence put God in mind of taking Vengeance upon the *Jews*. For the *loud Voice* here does not ſignify praying, or deſiring Revenge, but the greatneſs of the Crime, which is ſaid *to cry unto God*, becauſe the thing it ſelf does as much implore the divine Juſtice, as if the injured Perſon called upon him with a loud Voice. This appears by the example of the Blood of *Abel*, and the Story of the *Sodomites*, in *Gen.* xviii. 20.

Verſ. 12. *Note* g. I. There is no doubt but great numbers of dead Bodies ſend forth exhalations into the Air; but that Clouds have been made

made by them, and visible Meteors, whereby the Sun has been made black, and the Moon bloody, was never, I believe, by any one observed: And therefore the prophetical Expressions, in which great Calamities are represented under such Images, are not taken from what really is, but are rather a *Prosopopeia*, whereby the Sun is said to refuse to behold the impieties of Men, and the Moon upon that account to blush and become red with shame, when they are very great. There are a great many such figurative Expressions in the Poets, as in *Ovid.* Metam. v. where speaking of the prodigies that preceded the death of *Julius Cæsar*, he says, Chapter VI.

——Phœbi *quoque tristis imago*
Lurida sollicitis præbebat lumina terris.
——*Sparsi* Lunares *sanguine currus.*

II. I do not think we ought, in the representation of those Miseries that befel *Judæa*, under the Similitude of the Sun becoming black, and the Moon red, and the Stars falling, to consider the several parts distinctly, but all these things together; which without doubt signify very great Calamities, but must not be examin'd particularly as if they had each a specifick signification, which can be proved by no place of Scripture: see on the contrary *Isa.* xiii. 10. where all these things signify one thing conjunctly, and nothing at all separately. Add also the place in the same Prophet, alledged by our Author.

Vers. 15. *Note* i. I. The φωνὴ ἀδόξα in *Josephus* should not have been rendred *the promiscuous Noise* or *Voice*; for what is a promiscuous Noise, but *the sudden Voice*, as it is translated by *Sigism. Gelenius?* The Passage which the *Doctor* afterwards cites as out of *Josephus*, without naming him, in these words, *the seditious go to the Palace where many had laid up their Wealth, drive out the* Romans *thence, kill eight thousand of them, four thousand* Jews *that had gotten thither for Shelter, plunder the place*, is not exactly translated from the Greek, which is thus, Lib. vii. cap. 37. according to the Greek division: Οἱ στασιασταὶ δὴ τὸν βασιλικὸν ἐμβάντες οἶκον, εἰς ὃν δι' ἀσφάλειαν πολλοὶ τὰς κτήσεις ἐπέθηκαν, τούς τε Ῥωμαίους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τρέπονται, καὶ τὸ συνθροισμένον αὐτόθι τῶν δήμου πᾶν φονεύσαντες, ὄντας εἰς ὀκτακισχιλίους καὶ τετρακοσίους τὰ χρήματα διήρπασαν: that is, *the Seditious went into the Palace, in which, because it was a safe place, many had laid up their Possessions, and put the* Romans *to flight; and killing all the Inhabitants that were there gather'd together, to the number of eight thousand and four hundred, plunder'd their Riches.* Some difficulty there is in the words, Ῥωμαίους ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τρέπονται, which seem to be corrupted.

Chapter VII. II. I don't know why our Author should recur to the Walls of the Temple, to explain τὰ ἔσω τοῦ ἱεροῦ, when, besides the Mountain of the Temple, there were two other Mountains contained within the Walls of the City, under which there had been Vaults made, where the Jews hid themselves, as he himself relates out of *Josephus*. When there is a natural and literal interpretation ready at hand, what need is there of recurring to a violent one? However he interprets here τὰ ἔσω in *Mat.* xxvii. 51. *Walls* better than by *Sepulchres*. See my Note on that place.

CHAP. VII.

Verſ. 4. *Note* d. I. IT is not to be thought that the Priests of the *Jews* were so Religious, as in a matter which made for the Glory and Safety of the Jewish Nation, not to exceed at all in their account of the number of the Paschal Sacrifices. And therefore I should not suppose it as certain which *Josephus* says about this matter, who is otherwise very profuse in magnifying every thing which belonged to his own Nation. Nor indeed could *Palestine* contain so great a Multitude, in which besides *Jews*, there were a great many *Syrians*, as *Josephus* in several places affirms.

II. The Paschal Feast was eaten by all the *Jews* which at that time were in *Jerusalem*, and not only by the Inhabitants of *Palestine*. For there is no doubt but many that were scattered abroad into other Countries, went thither about that time; tho all the Males went not, nor any one perhaps every Year, besides those that were near. So that if we compare the Christians of *Judæa* with the unbelieving Inhabitants of the same Tracts, they will be more than our Author thought. The calculation which he speaks of is made by *Josephus*, *de Bell. Jud.* Lib. vii. c. 41.

CHAP. VIII.

Chapter VIII. Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I Will not deny but the figures here used in the description of that which St. *John* saw done in Heaven, are taken from the Temple of *Jerusalem*: but I do not think that the things done in that Temple are by way of Vision here described, as Dr. *Hammond* says; who yet undoubtedly meant that St. *John* saw something, I know not what, done in Heaven, like those things which were done in the Temple; for he never so much as dreamt that the Priest who went into the Sanctuary, offer'd up the prayers of the Christians. But a habit of speaking improperly made him expres himself

himself very awkwardly; and I doubt not but his Conceptions themselves were a little dark and perplexed, for otherwise he would never have spoken so harshly. But by this means, instead of giving light to the Writer we attempt to explain, we render him more obscure. Our Author here several times mentions the High Priest, whom he describes as offering up the daily Incense; which it's true he might sometimes do, but he did not do it daily. For that Office was for the most part executed by the ordinary Priests. See *Luke* i. 9. Chapter IX.

Vers. 12. *Note* g. Many things might have been said against the former Interpretation, which is certainly very violent, unless our Author had preferred the latter; and therefore I shall speak only to that, which to me does not seem at all more probable. For that prophetical words may be said to signify any thing particularly, it must either plainly appear by the event, or be shewn it is the Custom of the Prophets. But Dr. *Hammond* here does neither. And therefore I had rather say, that as the darkning of the Sun, Moon and Stars, in the Prophets signifies very great Calamities, even such as end in utter Destruction; so proportionably the darkning of a third part of them signifies lighter distresses. This is the only probable interpretation of this place, all others being made up of pure Fancy and Conjecture.

CHAP. IX.

Vers. 11. *Note* e. WHAT is this to the *Jews*, who did not worship *Apollo?* Or why should the Devil be called *Apollo* rather than *Jupiter?* I rather think this Title is to be applied to *John* the Captain of the *Sicarii*, who is called here himself *the Angel of the bottomless pit*, as his Soldiers, like so many Locusts, are said to have come out of its smoke, in *verse* 2. the meaning of which expressions is, that this *John* and his Soldiers were stirred up and assisted by the Devil in contriving those Villanies which they executed with so much fury: see what Dr. *Hammond* himself says on *vers.* 1. out of *Josephus*, or rather *Josephus* himself in Lib. iii. de *Bell. Jud.* Cap. x. & *seqq.* in the Greek.

Vers. 17. *Note* g. I chuse to interpret what is here said simply, and in gross, omitting all niceties which are very uncertain, about an exceeding formidable Army, which should bring very great Calamities, among which the principal are burnings and slaughters, upon *Judæa*. This is what is meant by the colour of the Armour, and the Fire proceeding out of the Mouth of the Horses. This only seems to be certain, every thing else is but conjectural. Of the Discipline of

Chapter X. of the *Roman* Armies it may be worth our while to read what is ſaid by *Joſephus* in Lib. iii. de *Bell. Jud.* Cap. 5. in the Greek.

CHAP. X.

Verſ. 9. Τὴν κοιλίαν.] The *Alexandrian* Copy reads καρδίαν, but it is a manifeſt Error. Κοιλία here, as בטן *beten*, in *Ezekiel*, is not taken for the Belly, but for the Stomach: For the Meat deſcends out of the Mouth immediately into the Stomach, and thoſe things which remain ſtill in the Stomach may cauſe a bitterneſs in the Mouth, but not thoſe which have paſſed into the Bowels. If any ſhould doubt whether κοιλία ſignifies the Stomach, he might be referred not only to the Greek Phyſicians, but alſo to *Ælian Variar. Hiſt.* Lib. 1. c. 1.

CHAP. XI.

Chapter XI. Verſ. 3. *Note* b. I. IF theſe *Witneſſes* are to be ſought in *Judæa*, I had rather ſay that two of the famous Churches of *Judæa*, in two diſtinct Cities, as *Jeruſalem* and *Cæſarea*, are ſignified by that name, than go to explain the uncertain meaning of an obſcure place, by a very uncertain Conjecture. Our Author builds conjectures upon conjectures, and is not afraid leſt a ſtructure that leans upon ſuch weak props, ſhould fall to the ground. But it is the part of a careful Interpreter to be very ſparing in Conjectures, and in doubtful matters to abſtain from Conſectaries; for the more uncertainties are heap'd together, the more that which is ſaid appears to be falſe, or at leaſt the Conjecturers are in greater danger of erring. But I confeſs ingenuouſly I do not underſtand theſe Prophecies; and tho I eaſily ſee what there is wanting in the conjectures of learned Men, to make them ſeem probable, I can my ſelf propoſe nothing better. For which reaſon I have in many places forborn to confute Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretations, becauſe I did not think it worth my while to ſhew that others were unfortunate in their Conjectures, when I my ſelf could produce nothing more certain. But here I thought fit to ſay ſomething about the Conjecture of Dr. *Hammond* concerning two ſorts of Biſhops in the Apoſtles time, in ſingle Cities; becauſe that may make for the illuſtration of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

II. It appears indeed by *Acts* xv. and other places, that there was ſome diſagreement between the Jewiſh and Gentile Chriſtians, and that theſe latter had a Letter ſent them, which is there ſet down. But that there were two diſtinct Churches, and two ſorts of Biſhops, can be

be gather'd from no ſign. Nor is it at all probable, that after this Apoſtolical Decree, the Jewiſh Chriſtians refuſed to unite with the *Gentiles*; eſpecially *Jeruſalem* being deſtroyed, and St. *Paul* having written ſo many Epiſtles about the unprofitableneſs of the Moſaical Rites. There are no credible Records by which it may appear that *Evodius* and *Ignatius* were together Biſhops of the *Antiochian* Churches. In the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions *Lib.* vii. c. 46. it is ſaid indeed that *Evodius* was ordained by St. *Peter* (not by St. *John*, as it is ſaid by the *Doctor*) and *Ignatius* by St. *Paul*. But not to ſay that we cannot eaſily believe that Writer, as being a notorious Impoſtor; he does not ſay that they were made Biſhops at the ſame time, and of ſeveral Congregations, as is well obſerved on that place by *J. Bapt. Cotelerius*, who has alſo other things worth reading about this matter. Chapter XI.

III. What is ſaid here about St. *John*'s ruling the Jewiſh Churches in *Aſia*, while St. *Paul*, and after him *Timothy* ruled the *Gentiles*, is a mere invention of our Author. There is no footſtep of a twofold Epiſcopacy in thoſe places; and that *Timothy* was firſt Biſhop of *Epheſus* is alſo very uncertain, becauſe he might be left there by St. *Paul* as an Evangeliſt, not as a Biſhop: for the late Catalogues are not worthy our regard, which reckon up the Biſhops of antient times, according to the opinion of the Age in which they were written, and not according to any certain knowledg. They tell us indeed that the Apoſtles themſelves were Biſhops, which is abſurd, tho Dr. *Hammond* alſo ſpeaks in the ſame manner. But granting him that *Timothy* was Biſhop of *Epheſus*, ſtill there are two things that remain doubtful: One is, that *John* was at *Epheſus*, or ſomewhere near it, when *Timothy* was left there by St. *Paul*. And ſecondly, that both of them performed the Office of Biſhop in different Congregations; and that St. *John* did not come thither after *Timothy*'s Ordination, and exerciſe only the Office of an Apoſtle, not of a Biſhop. It's plain the Writer of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, whoſe Authority the *Doctor* elſewhere makes uſe of, ſays that *Timothy* was conſtituted Biſhop of that City by St. *Paul*, and *John* by St. *John*.

IV. What is ſaid here of the Church of *Rome* was, I believe, invented by Dr. *Hammond*, to reconcile the Antients that diſagreed among themſelves about the firſt Biſhop of *Rome* after the Apoſtles; but he never found in any credible Hiſtory, that two Apoſtles were Biſhops of the *Roman* Church, and had each their Deacon, whom they left in their place. The Apoſtles could not be Biſhops of any particular Church, and they are mere Dreams which are related concerning the Deaconſhip of *Linus* and *Clemens*. Whoever deſires to be informed

about

Chapter about those beginnings of the Church of *Rome*, may consult Dr. *Pear-*
XI. *son*, and Mr. *Dodwel's Dissert.* about the first Bishops of that City. I wonder our Author, who had such sharp adversaries to deal with, ventured to propose such things without proof. The conjunction of two Churches at *Rome* under *Clemens*, is also another Fiction, of which there is nothing at all said by any of the Antients. The Author of the *Apostol. Constit.* affirms, that *Linus* was ordained by St. *Paul*, and *Clemens* μετὰ τὸν Λίνου τελευτὴν, *after the death of Linus*. On which place see *Cotelerius*.

V. That after the restoring of *Jerusalem* by *Adrian*, or a little before, there were two Bishops of *Jerusalem*, none of the Antients ever said. *Eusebius*, in *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 4. c. 5. where he sets down the succession of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, tells us, that the time during which they were Bishops was unknown, but that fifteen sat till the Siege of *Adrian*, which were all Jews by descent. Then he adds, συνεχὲς ἦν τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἐκκλησίαις ἐξ Ἑβραίων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀποστόλων ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον διαμεμενηκυῖα πολυανθρωπίας, *that all the Church under them was made up of believing Jews, who had continued from the Apostles to the Siege which then happen'd.* By this it appears, that there were not two Congregations at that time in *Jerusalem*; nor indeed does *Eusebius* mention those fifteen Bishops, as if some of them had been Bishops together, but all one after another. That there were many Bishops within a short compass of time, may as well be attributed either to their being of a great age when they were elected, or the sudden death wherewith some of them were overtaken, as to a multiplicity of Bishops in one City. The same Historian, in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Calamities which befel the Jews under *Adrian*, and related how *Jerusalem* was restored, and called *Ælia*, in honour of *Ælius Adrian*, subjoins; Καὶ δὴ ἡ αὐτόθι ἐκκλησία ἐκ τῶν συγγενῶν συνεστῶσα, πρῶτος μετὰ τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς ἐπισκόπους, τὸν τῆς ἐκεῖσε λειτουργίαν ἐγχειρίζεται Μάρκος: *and the Church of the same place being composed of Gentiles*, Marcus *first, after the Bishops of the Circumcision, undertook the Priesthood over them that were there.* He does not say συνεστώσης ἐκκλησίας ἐξ Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ ἐθνῶν, *the Church being composed of Jews and Gentiles*, as he ought to have said according to Dr. *Hammond*'s Opinion.

VI. Diversity of languages could be no reason for the Jewish and Gentile Christians keeping up distinct assemblies, because the Jews of old, as also now, understood the languages of the places in which they lived; or at least the Greek, which obtained in all *Asia* as well as in *Greece*: and for that reason there were so many Greek Translations made of the Old Testament for the sake of the Jews, that of the

Septuagint,

Septuagint, *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, &c. And whatever were the Customs of the Jews, there are extant no Records whereby it appears, that after the Apostles times they refused to meet in the same Assemblies with the Gentiles; nor can any such thing be gather'd from the writings of the Apostles, as that they were forced in every particular Town or City to constitute two Bishops and two Churches: For all Differences are not open Schisms. So that there is no reason why we should assent to Dr. *Hammond*, obtruding upon us a raw Conjecture, almost for a certain Truth. It would be easy to find any thing in antient History, if we might be allowed to reason after the same rate, and interpret the Antients by supplying what is wanting in them with Conjecture, as if they said in so many words what we infer only by guessing from doubtful signs. Chapter XII.

CHAP. XII.

Vers. 6. *Note* c. OUR Author owes what he says here to *Cæsar Baronius*, as many other things, which he took and set down out of him without examination, which made him judg amiss of the place in *Tacitus*; for *Tacitus* does not give the least intimation of his thinking that the Christians were guilty of firing the City. For after he had said, in *Annal.* lib. xv. c. 44. that the scandal of the City's being burn'd by the Emperor's order, could not be wip'd off by any humane endeavours, nor by the Princes gifts, nor by imploring the Gods, he subjoyns: *Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos*, where the Verb *subdere* is all one as *loco veri auctoris alium supponere*, *to substitute another in the place of the true Author*; and *reus* does not signify one convinced of any crime, but only one that is accused, as all know that understand Latin. Afterwards he describes the rise and progress of Christianity from *Judæa* as far as *Rome*, and at length relates the Torments endured by the Christians, in these words: *Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur*, *first those were taken up who confessed*, namely, that they were Christians, not those that set the City on fire, as *Baronius* misinterprets it, and after him Dr. *Hammond*, which the following words clearly shew: *Deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens*, HAUD PERINDE *in crimine incendii*, *quam odio humani generis convicti sunt: then by their discovery a great multitude was convicted* NOT SO MUCH *of the crime of having set on fire the City*, *as of hatred to mankind.* If they had confessed it, they would have been found guilty, by their very own confession. I do not vindicate *Tacitus* for his hatred against the Christians, and his shameful ignorance in the business of Religion; but only from the Lye which he is falsly charged with.

Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 7. Καὶ ἐδόθη πόλεμον, &c.] Here our Author, in his Paraphraſe, after *Grotius*, entertains us with a nauſeous Fable about the contention of *Simon* with St. *Peter*; which I have confuted on 2 *Theſſ.* ii. They that believe ſuch Stories, either have not examin'd them, or believe what they pleaſe, not what they are ſure is true.

Verſ. 10. Κατεβλήθη ὁ κατήγωρ.] Of the caſting down the Devil from Heaven, ſee my Note on *Luk.* x. 18. As this caſting down from Heaven is to be underſtood metaphorically, of loſs of power; ſo alſo the War which went before it, of the attempts of the Jews and ſuperſtitious Heathens againſt the Preachers of the Goſpel, which Attempts it is propheſied ſhould be vain; not of the fabulous Conflict of *Simon Peter* with *Simon Magus*.

CHAP. XIII.

Verſ. 1. *Note* a. I. IT was not worth the while to cite *Auſonius*, a Chriſtian Poet, when there were Heathen Poets ready at hand. And beſides, the laſt Verſe is not rightly quoted, which is;

Hæc erit æternæ ſeries ab origine Romæ,

not *mundi*. See the four Epigrams, which are at the end of the *Epigr.* of *Auſonius*. There are a great many Medals in which *Rome* is ſtiled ETERNAL. See *Numiſm. Impp. Præſtant.* collected by *J. Valentius*.

II. *Martial* in Epigr. lib. xii. Ep. 8.

Terrarum DEA, *gentiumque Roma*,
Cui par eſt nihil, & nihil ſecundum.

Car. Patinus in the beginning of his Collection *Numiſm. Ær. Impp.* mentions 4 pieces of Coin, in which over the figure of a Womans head, with a Tower or Helmet upon it, there is this inſcription, ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. And thoſe pieces were coined by the *Synnadenſes*, *Temenothuritæ*, *Amoriani*, and *Ancyrani*. He alſo ſpeaks of other pieces of Coin inſcribed thus, ΙΕΡΑ ΣΥΓΚΛΗΤΟΣ, and ΙΕΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣ, which are all names of Blaſphemy attributed to *Rome* and the *Romans*.

Verſ. 3. *Note* b. I ſhall add ſome things here at the end of this Note, which will partly confirm, and partly confute what Dr. *Hammond* ſays.

I. It's

I. It's true that εἷς *one* may by a Hebraiſm ſignify that which is firſt in order, or number; but as the Hebrew word אחד *ebhad*, which is rendred εἷς, never ſignifies firſt in dignity, ſo neither can μία κεφαλῶν ſignify the *chief of the heads*. Nor is it neceſſary that this Phraſe ſhould be ſo underſtood, that *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretation may ſtand. It is ſufficient if μία do but ſignify *one*. So that Dr. *Hammond* had no reaſon to enlarge *Grotius* his Note with this falſe Interpretation. Chapter XIII.

II. It is true indeed that *Livy* affirms, *caput humanum aperientibus fundamenta Templi apparuiſſe: that a mans head was found by thoſe who dug up the foundations of the Temple*, but is falſe that the Oracle was conſulted. They conſulted an *Hetrurian* Prophet, as we are told by *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* lib. iv. *Ed. Wechel.* pag. 257. and he anſwered: ὅτι κεφαλὴ εὑρεθεῖσα ἡνίκα ὤρυττον Ἰταλίας ἅπαντος ἔσεσθαι τοῦτον ἐν ᾧ κεφαλὴ εὑρέθη: *that the Fates had determined, that that place, in which they had found the Head, ſhould be the Head of all Italy.* Which is expreſſed in this manner by *Livy* lib. 1. c. 51. *Quæ viſa ſpecies haud per ambages, arcem eam Imperii, caputque rerum fore portendebat; idque ita cecinere vates, quique in urbe erant, quoſque ad eam rem conſultandam ex Etruria acciverant. Which ſight clearly portended that that place ſhould be the chief ſtrength of the Empire, and the Head of the World; and ſo it was interpreted by the Prophets, both thoſe that were in the City, and thoſe that were ſent for out of Etruria to be conſulted about that matter.*

III. That the deadly wound here given to the Beaſt may be rightly underſtood of the burning of the *Capitol*, appears, not only by what is ſaid by *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, but alſo by the opinion which the Records of the Heathens ſhew them to have had about ſuch an Event. For here we are not to conſider the thing it ſelf, but the mens opinion, from which the Chriſtians might rightly argue againſt the Heathens. It was ordinarily therefore look'd upon as a Prodigy, if a Temple was touched from Heaven; and that Prodigy was ſo much the greater, by how much more magnificent or venerable the Temple was thought to be. *Livy* will ſupply us with a great many ſuch Examples, but ſee particularly lib. xxvii. c. 4. where among other Prodigies it is related, *Jovis ædis culmen fulmine ictum, ac prope omni tecto nudatum: that the top of Jupiters Temple was ſtruck with a thunderbolt, and almoſt ſtript of all its covering.* So alſo *Cicero* in the ſecond Book about his Conſulſhip, among the Prodigies portending *Catilines* Conſpiracy, made mention of this, as appears from lib. 1. de *Divin.* c. 12.

Chapter XIII.

Nunc ea Torquato quæ quondam & Conſule Cotta,
Lydius ediderat Tyrrhenæ Gentis aruſpex,
Omnia fixa tuus glomerans determinat annus.
Nam pater altitonans, ſtellanti nixus Olympo,
Ipſe ſuos quondam tumulos ac Templa petivit,
Et Capitolinis injecit ſedibus ignes.

All thoſe things which were heretofore under the Conſulſhip of Torquatus and Cotta, foretold by Lydius the Etrurian Prophet, are now ratified, and accompliſhed; for Jupiter has ſometime ſince ſmitten his own Hills and Temples, and thrown fire into the Capitol. And therefore the burning of the Capitol under *Veſpaſian* was counted a very great calamity, as we may ſee by theſe tragical words of *Tacitus* in *Hiſt.* lib. iii. c. 72. *Id facinus poſt conditam urbem, luctuoſiſſimum, fœdiſſimumque populo Romano accidit; nullo externo hoſte, propitiis, ſi per mores noſtros liceret, Deis; ſedem Jovis Opt. Max. auſpicato à majoribus pignus imperii conditam, quam non Porſena dedita urbe, neque Galli capta, temerare potuiſſent, furore principum exſcindi. Arſerat & ante Capitolium civili bello, ſed fraude privata; nunc palam obſeſſum, palam incenſum. Quibus armorum cauſis, quo tantæ cladis pretio pro patria bellavimus?* &c. *This Action, ſince the firſt building of the City, was the moſt diſmal and ſhameful that ever happen'd to the People of* Rome; *that when we had no foreign enemy at our gates, and the Gods, for any thing we had done to provoke them, were propitious to us, the ſeat of the great and excellent* Jupiter, *ominouſly erected as a pledg of Dominion, which neither* Porſena, *when the City was delivered to him, nor the* Gauls, *who took it by Aſſault, had been able to break into, ſhould be deſtroyed by the fury of our own Princes. Once alſo before, the Capitol was burnt, during a Civil War, but it was then by ſecret fraud; now it was openly beſet, and openly ſet on fire. Was it for this, and that ſo great a Calamity might befal us, that we have been engaged in ſo many Wars, and fought ſo long for our Country?* How great the fame of this Accident was among neighbouring Nations, and how they interpreted it as a Prodigy, the ſame Writer tells us in *Hiſt.* l. 4. c. 54. where having made mention of the Commotions that were in *Gaul* and *Germany*, he ſaith, *Nihil æque quam incendium Capitolii, ut finem Imperii adeſſe crederent, impulerat. Captam olim à Gallis urbem; ſed integra Jovis ſede, manſiſſe Imperium. Fatali nunc igne, ſignum cœleſtis iræ datum, & poſſeſſionem rerum humanarum Tranſalpinis gentibus portendi ſuperſtitione vana Druidæ canebant.* Nothing had ſo much inclined them to think that the end of the (Roman) *Empire was come, as the burning of the Capitol. That the City had been*

formerly

formerly taken by the Gauls, *but* Jupiter's *Seat ſtanding ſafe, the Empire had continued. Now that by this fatal fire it appeared the Gods were incenſed againſt the* Romans, *and deſigned to confer the government of the World upon the Nations beyond the* Alps, *was the ſuperſtitious tone of the* Druids. So that theſe Commotions being appeaſed, and the Capitol rebuilt, it might be ſaid that the deadly wound was healed. Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 8. *Note* e. It ſhould have been added, with *Grotius*, that the word γεγραμμένα is underſtood, *in the book of life of the Lamb ſlain*, written *from the beginning of the world*; that is, in which God from the beginning of the World, until this time, began to write the names of the Confeſſors and Martyrs for the Truth, whom wicked men had perſecuted or killed for its ſake: for of a man that is alive it cannot be ſaid, *his name was not written from the beginning of the world*, inſtead of *never*; for it could not be written before he was born, ſuppoſing the Diſcourſe to be about a Catalogue only of thoſe who have begun to live, as it is here, which Dr. *Hammond* acknowledges.

Verſ. 10. *Note* f. I do by no means think, that S. *John* here has a reſpect to *Paſſive Obedience*, as our Author's Countrymen ſpeak, but to the Perſecutors themſelves; to whom it is foretold, by this Proverb, that it ſhould be their lot to ſuffer the ſame things they inflicted upon others. See *Grotius* on this place. To this purpoſe is the Subject of *Lactantius* his Book *de mortibus Perſecutorum*. So that in this place their Opinion is neither approved nor condemned, who think it lawful to oppoſe force by force, provided there be a proſpect of doing it ſucceſsfully, and without too much bloodſhed. Nor is there any thing ſaid about this matter in the places which the Doctor cites; and it is a thing which it's probable he would not here have thought of, unleſs he had lived in the days of *Cromwel*. But thoſe things which pleaſe us, we bring to mind upon the leaſt occaſion.

Verſ. 15. *Note* m. Excepting the place in the *Maccabees*, all our Author here ſays is taken out of *Hugo Grotius*, who treats of the ſame matter more largely and accurately. I have alledged a more antient example to this purpoſe on *Numb.* xxxv. 6. than any alledged by either of them. See alſo what *Spencer* has collected about this Subject, de *Rit. Moſ. Legg.* l. 2. c. 14.

Verſ. 17. *Note* n. What our Author here ſays, of the ſeveral ways whereby ſacred *marks* were received, and what follows as far as the citation of *Martianus Capella*, he took for the moſt part out of *Grotius*, but excepting theſe words: *Of theſe* Servius *and* Virgil *makes frequent mention*, [perhaps it may be ſo printed in that Edition of Dr. *Hammond* which Mr. *Le Clerc* uſed; but in the ſecond Edition of it, it is,

Of

Chapter XIII. *Of theſe* Servius ON Virgil, *&c.* which if Mr. *Le Clerc* had known he would not have made this remark] which are a manifeſt corruption of theſe words of *Grotius*: *Talia myſtica nomina etiam aliis Diis fuiſſe ex Servio diſcimus: that other Gods alſo had ſuch myſtical names we may learn from* Servius. *Virgil* himſelf no where makes mention of ſuch names, much leſs does he frequently mention them, and perhaps it is but in one place they are mentioned by *Servius*.

II. They that had received the mark of *Bacchus*, were not for that reaſon called ναρθηκοφόροι, but becauſe when they danced at *Bacchus* his Feaſts, they really carried in their hands *a bunch of Ivy*, or a νάρθηξ.

III. I wonder that our learned Author, who interprets the firſt Beaſt of the Idolatry of *Rome*, and eſpecially of the *Capitol*, did not ſeek for the number of the Beaſt in the names of the Gods of the *Capitol*. I my ſelf, ſuppoſing what is ſaid by *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* to be true, and conjecturing that *the mark of the name*, or of *the number of the Beaſt*, muſt contain the number made by the letters of the names of *Jupiter* and *Juno*, who were chiefly worſhipped in the *Capitol*, and ſignify that he who bore that mark, was a worſhipper of thoſe Gods, found the number of the Beaſt, χξϛ', in theſe words:

Δ	4
Ι	10
Ο	70
Σ	200
Ε	5
Ι	10
Μ	40
Ι	10
Η	8
Η	8
Ρ	100
Α	1
Σ	200
	666

So

So that he who had theſe Letters χξϛ written on his wriſt, which made 666, it was the ſame as if he had had written upon him Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἥρα, *I am of* Jupiter *or of* Juno; whereby they profeſſed themſelves to be worſhippers of the Gods of the *Capitol*. This or ſome ſuch thing ſeems to be ſignified, not that it was always done, or that the Chriſtians were forced to receive ſuch marks upon them, for fear of being barred all commerce with the reſt of mankind; but that which is ſignified is the publick profeſſion of Idolatry, of which the bearing ſuch marks was a notable token. This Conjecture I do not propoſe as certain, for I confeſs there are few things in theſe Prophecies which I clearly underſtand, but as better agreeing with the reſt of the interpretations of Learned men, than that which is ſaid by *Grotius*, who ſought for the number of the Beaſt in the name ΟΤΑΙΤΙΟϹ, which was that of *Trajan*. For *the name of the Beaſt* cannot be the name of a Prince, unleſs that Prince be counted a *Beaſt*; which *Grotius* did not think, who interprets the beaſt *Idololatriam ferino more ſævientem*, *Idolatry raging like a wild Beaſt*, on *verſe* 1. in his *Explic.* of this Chapter, firſt printed with the Goſpels, as alſo in his laſt Works, afterward publiſhed with his Annotations on the Epiſtles. Chapter XIII.

Verſ. 18. *Note* o. I. As I was rendring the foregoing Annotation into Latin, I thought of a reaſon of the obſcurity that is in theſe Prophecies; which upon thorow conſideration I looked upon to be very probable, and therefore I ſhall here propoſe it, which is, that a great part of theſe Predictions being about things that were ſhortly to be fulfilled by the *Romans*, and St. *John* ſpeaking of theſe as the enemies of God, by whom they were alſo ſuddenly to be deſtroyed, it was not ſafe either for himſelf, or for others to whom he communicated theſe Prophecies, that the matter of them ſhould be more clearly repreſented; leſt the Book falling into the hands of the *Romans*, ſhould be a means to enrage them. But how could they be underſtood, you will ſay? and of what uſe were they, if they were not underſtood? To this I anſwer, I doubt not but St. *John* himſelf very well knew what every thing in them meant, and explained the contents of them to the Biſhops of *Aſia*, and the wiſeſt part of ordinary Chriſtians, ſo far as it was neceſſary for them to underſtand the accompliſhment of theſe Predictions. But their meaning not being thought fit to be indifferently communicated to all, leſt the imprudence of ſome perſons ſhould bring the Apoſtle and the Churches into danger; the memory of their ſecret ſignification, eſpecially upon the intervening of Perſecution, was in a little time loſt, and it is no wonder that it did not deſcend to *Irenæus*.

II. The

Chapter XIII.

II. The distance of so many Ages is no hindrance at all to our understanding these Prophecies, considered in it self; but the want of Historical Records, that were perhaps heretofore written both by Christians and Heathens, out of which, if they were extant, we might undoubtedly come to know many of the circumstances which are here referred to. We should make out the sense better than the Antients themselves, who did nothing by rule and method; for which reason most of their Interpretations of Scripture are impertinent, and do not suite with their great reputation. I wonder that our learned Author rejects the Judgment of *Irenæus*, about the way of explaining this place, for such silly reasons; but perhaps after he had searched a great while and could find nothing himself, he had a mind to deter others from an enquiry, which he thought would be to no purpose. It is a mistake that the custom of expressing a name by numbers was not known to the Greeks of that age, for what else can be meant by *the number of the name?* Does not *Irenæus*, who lived *almost in the time* of St. *John*, as he himself speaks, mention it as a thing which was known? in lib. v. c. 3. Is there not some such thing in the *Books of the Sibyls*, as Dr. *Hammond* himself has before observed, which most Learned men suppose to have been counterfeited in the second age? Does not also *Irenæus* in lib. 2. c. 40, and 42. expressly affirm that the *Valentinians* used the art of numbering the letters of names, for their numeral signification? But granting St. *John* to have taken what he says from the custom of the Jews, yet why might not he apply to the Greek letters what was usual in the Hebrew, seeing he wrote in Greek? For to suppose a man writing in Greek, and that to men who understand only that language, to think of the Hebrew names of the Idolatry of the Romans, is, in earnest, too much to indulge Conjectures, and to consider only what is *possible*, and not what is *probable*. So, 'tis certain, *Barnabas* searched for an Arithmetical mystery in the Greek letters, in cap. ix. of his Epistle. What our Author says about two ways of expressing numbers among the Greeks (to grant now that the thing is well expressed by him) is nothing to the purpose. For however numbers are expressed, it is all one, if that number be but found in the name which is written with its letters. We may express DC. LXVI. in Greek thus, χξς', or by two Η, of which the first shall be within a great Π, which signifies πύλη, a Δ inclosed in the like figure, and another Δ alone, and then last of all the letters ΙΙΙ. But neither way are the letters of the name expressed otherwise than by their numeral signification. Dr. *Hammond* does not seem to have well understood what he meant, when he argued from a twofold way of expressing numbers against *Irenæus*.

III. As

III. As he rashly affirmed that the Greeks, in that Age, were not acquainted with this way of expressing a name, by the number of the letters; so without reason he attributes the invention of it to the *Rabbins*, who perhaps borrowed it themselves from the Greeks. Doubtless *Gematria* is a mere corruption of the Greek word γεωμετρία; and it is probable that that custom would not have had a Greek name, if it had not been derived from the Greeks. I acknowledg indeed that the Rabbins did more frequently use this way of signifying names than the Greeks. [*It should seem by this that Mr.* Le Clerc *misunderstood Dr.* Hammond, *for the Doctor does not say, as he represents him, that the custom of expressing names by numbers was not* known *at that time by the* Greeks, *but that it was not* ordinary *among them, and that it was very usual among the Rabbins of that age, unless* not ordinary, inusitatum, *as he translates him, and* not known, ignotum, *be the same.*] But this was owing to the vain fancies of the Jews, who made too much use of it. So that our Author had no reason to slight the forementioned way of finding out the name of the Beast, if he had not taken some pains himself about this matter to no purpose. Chapter XIV.

Ibid. Ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστί.] *Grotius* interprets this in his first Explication of this Chapter, *nomen viri principis ex quo, post exutam libertate Rempublicam, tempora maxime cognoscebantur*: *the name of a Prince, by which, after the Commonwealth was deprived of its liberty, the times were especially known*; and the same he expresses in other words in his last Explication of it. But *first*, the question here is, what is the number of the name of the Beast, not of a Man, as I have already said. *Secondly*, St. *John* would rather have said ἀνδρὸς than ἀνθρώπου. Lastly, it is nothing to this place, that the times were signified by the names of Emperors; for St. *John* does not speak about the time when the Beast was to shew it self, but about his name expressed in numbers. What is then *the number of a man*? I answer, a small number, or one not so great that a man cannot count it. So μέτρον ἀνθρώπου is used afterwards in *Chap.* xxi. 17. where see my Note.

CHAP. XIV.

Vers. 2. Ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων πολλῶν.] This is rightly understood by *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, of multitudes of converted Gentiles. *Ovid* twice uses the same comparison, speaking of a tumult of people, *Metam.* lib. v. Fab. 1.

Chapter XIV.

Adſimilare freto poſſis quod ſæva quietum
Ventorum rabies motis exaſperat undis.

You may compare them to the Sea, which the fierce rage of the Winds makes rough with Waves. And Metam. xv. Fab. 49.

——— *Qualia fluctus*
Æquorei faciunt ſiquis procul audiat illos,
Tale ſonat populus.

Such a noiſe as the waves of the Sea make, when they are heard afar off, was made by the people.

Verſ. 10. *Note* d. I have already on *Matt.* xxvii. 34. rejected Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretation of this place, becauſe θυμὸς θεῦ is no where uſed to ſignify *the bitterneſs*, or *poyſon of God*, which is an abſurd phraſe. We muſt render this place thus: *of the Wine of the wrath of God, which is without mixture poured into the cup of his indignation*, for κεκερασμένον frequently ſignifies *to pour in*, as Mr. *Gataker* had ſhewn at large in *Adverſ.* cap. v. where he has collected a great many things about this, and the like phraſes.

Verſ. 13. Τὰ δ' ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν.] It is ſaid that riches do not follow rich men, becauſe it is of no advantage after death, to have been rich in this world: but on the contrary, here it is ſaid of good men, that their works follow them, becauſe they receive the reward promiſed to them, from God. To this purpoſe are the verſes of *Euripides in Temeno.*

Ἀρετὴ δ' κἂν θάνῃ τις οὐκ ἀπόλλυται
Ζῇ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ὄλβῳ συμφορᾷ, κακὸν δὲ
Ἅπαντα φεῦδε συνθανὸν ὑπὸ χθονός.

Virtue when any one dies, is not deſtroyed,
But lives even after the diſſolution of the body; but when a bad man
Dies, all he poſſeſſes periſhes, and deſcends with him under the earth.

Which are in *Florileg. Stobæi* Tit. 1. So the *Rabbins* in *Pirke Aboth* cap. penult. *In the hour wherein a man departs out of this life,* אין מלוין לו *neither Silver, nor Gold, nor precious Stones, nor Pearls ſtick by a man, but only the Law and good Works.*

Verſ. 20. *Note* h. Our Author did not well underſtand *Grotius*, who does not ſay theſe ſlaughters happen'd in *Judea*, but interprets ἀπὸ φαύλων χιλίων ἑξακοσίων, *extra Judææ terminos, without the limits of Judea.*

dea. Ingens hæc, ſaith he, *effuſio ſanguinis Judæorum & Gentilium facta eſt, Trajano imperante, non in Judæa, ſed in locis Judææ vicinis, id eſt, Syria, Ægypto, Cyrenaica, & Cypro. This great effuſion of blood, both of Jews and Gentiles, was made in the reign of* Trajan, *not in* Judea, *but in places near* Judea, *that is, in* Syria, Egypt, Cyrenaica, *and* Cyprus. Yet Dr. *Hammond* puts a more probable ſenſe upon this whole Chapter than *H. Grotius*. Chapter XV.

CHAP. XV.

Verſ. 3. Δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ.] That is, *juſt and righteous* (æquæ) *are thy ways*; for among the Greeks ἀληθὴς, and words properly ſignifying the ſame thing, are often taken for *æquus, righteous*. So ἐτήτυμος, in *Homer* and *Heſiod*, is frequently uſed for *righteous*: whence *Heſychius* hath, Ἀληθὴς, δίκαιος ἢ δίκαιος, *juſt*. It is a noted Verſe of *Horace*, which is the laſt of *Epiſt.* vii. lib. 1.

Metiri ſe quemque ſuo modulo ac pede verum *eſt.*

That is, ſay the old *Scholia*, *Æquum eſt, ac decet, it is juſt and fit*. To the ſame purpoſe is the Obſervation of *Priſcian*, in lib. xviii. fol. 115. *Ed. Badianæ*: "*Sophocles in his Ajax ſays*, δίκαιος γὰρ for *verus*, "*true. And our Latins alſo often put* verus *for* juſtus, *and* juſtus *for* "verus. As *Virgil*, Æneid. xii.

Quæcunque eſt fortuna, mea eſt, me verius *unum*
Pro vobis fœdus luere & decernere ferro.

"By *verius* he means *juſtius*.

CHAP. XVI.

Verſ. 12. Note e. I. WHat Dr. *Hammond* ſays about the *treacherous Bridg* of *Maxentius*, is falſe, and grounded upon a Miſinterpretation of *Euſebius*, who ſays indeed that *Maxentius* had made that Bridg μηχανὴν ὀλέθρου καθ' ἑαυτῷ, *for an engine of his own deſtruction*. But that came to paſs accidentally, not that the Bridg was ſo contrived as to fall in pieces of its own accord; for *Maxentius* would not have been ſuch a Fool, as to make uſe of that Bridg himſelf. Chapter XVI.

II. It is falſe that *Euſebius* ſays theſe things happen'd to *Conſtantine according to the prediction of the divine Oracles*, or thought that

Chapter XVII. S. *John* had a respect to them in this Vision. He only compares this Event with the antient Miracles, and applies some places of Scripture to it.

Vers. 17. *Note* i. St. *John* indeed seems to have taken this Phrase from the Stile of the Greeks and Latins; but that *it is usual in Propheeies to express sad events covertly*, as by an *Euphemismus*, I leave them to believe who never read them, or have forgotten them.

CHAP. XVII.

Vers. 3. *Note* b. DR. *Hammond* sometimes alledges the words of Writers so carelessly, that he does not so much as set down a perfect sense, as here in the words of *Tertullian*, which are in *cap.* 7. Ed. Rigaltianæ. *In quem enim alium universæ Gentes crediderunt, nisi in Christum qui jam venit? Cui enim & aliæ Gentes crediderunt, Parthi, Medi —— tunc & in Jerusalem Judæi, & cæteræ Gentes, ut jam Getulorum varietates, & Maurorum multi fines; Hispaniarum omnes termini & Galliarum diversæ nationes, & Britannorum inaccessa*, &c. *For in whom else have all Nations believed, but in the Christ who is now come? For whom have other Nations also believed, the* Parthians, Medes —— *then also the Jews in* Jerusalem, *and the rest of the World, as now the several Nations of the* Getuli, *and many Countries of the* Moors; *all the People of* Spain, *and divers Nations of* France, *and the places*, &c. But who will believe that *Tertullian*, according to the custom of zealous Declamers, did not make the thing more than it really was? It's certain there were but few Christians, if any, among those Nations, when they invaded the *Roman* Empire, and they did not receive the Christian Religion till they had fixed themselves in it. I shall say nothing about the counterfeit *Lucius* in *England*.

Vers. 5. *Note* c. The word μυστήριον considered in it self, signifies nothing shameful, nor could it be used by *Achilles Tatius* in the sense our Author here mentions, but improperly. I do not deny but in the *Eleusinia sacra* there were some indecent Rites used; but I do not think they were *so very unclean and abominable* as the Doctor supposes, nor will any one else think so that has read *Meursius* his *Eleusinia*, or is otherwise at all versed in Greek Writers. They concealed rather some Secrecies about the Gods, than any Lusts which they there indulged. And that the religious Solemnities of the *Romans* were commonly joined with Fornication or other such unclean Actions, no body will believe who is not a stranger to their History. There is no doubt indeed, but the strange Rites which were brought to *Rome*, were for that

that reaſon ſometimes forbidden, as the *Orgia* of *Bacchus*, in *Livy*, lib. xxxix. and the Rites of the *Egyptians* in *Tacitus*, Annal. lib. ii. cap. 85. But this very thing ſhows that the *Roman* Worſhip was not generally accompanied with Uncleanneſs, as our Author frequently affirms. It is falſly alſo ſaid by him, more than once, that Idolatry was propagated in other Countries from the City of *Rome*, when the Idolatry of the *Egyptians*, *Syrians*, and *Grecians*, was much more antient than the *Roman*. But *Rome* may be ſaid *to have made the Kings of the earth drunk with the wine of her Fornication*, becauſe ſhe reſolutely adhered to Idolatry, and confirmed it by her example, tho the Jews and Chriſtians had for ſome time upbraided her with it; and becauſe alſo ſhe went before many others in the Worſhip of the City of *Rome*, as a Goddeſs, and her Emperors. Chapter XVII.

Verſ. 8. *Note* d. Our learned Author does not ſeem to have well underſtood what it was in the time of *Veſpaſian*, *Cæſarem ſalutari*; for he thinks it was juſt the ſame as to be called *Auguſtus* and *Emperor*, which it is not; for at that time the Sons of the Emperors were called *Cæſars* aſſoon as ever their Fathers came to the Throne, but they were not therefore *Auguſti*. *Domitian*, in his Father's abſence, was indeed, at leaſt in ſhew, inveſted with the Government, becauſe the ſtate of Affairs requir'd it, no other daring to take upon him to be Emperor whilſt the Prince his ſon was preſent; but he was not therefore accounted *Auguſtus* [his Majeſty] or made Partaker of the ſupreme Power. So that no one could wonder if that unſettled Authority of *Domitian* ceaſed at his Father's Return, who had not intruſted him with the Empire. Yet that which our Author meant, might be ſaid, but in the words of *Grotius*, which he corrupted.

Verſ. 14. *Note* e. I. Our Author ſets down ſomewhat largely this Story, but without neceſſity, becauſe *Oroſius*, who lived in thoſe times, often affirms that the *Goths* were at that time Chriſtians, in *lib.* 7. The latter place cited out of him by our Author, I was a great while before I could find, for it is not in *lib.* 11. *c.* 10. as it is abſurdly ſet in the Margin, when *Oroſius* wrote only ſeven Books in all; but I met with it at laſt accidentally in *lib.* 2. *c.* 3. *Et Chriſtiani fuere qui parcerent, & Chriſtiani quibus parcerent, & Chriſtiani propter quorum memoriam, & in quorum memoriam parceretur.* The ſame Author has alſo the Story related by *Rubeus*, in *lib.* 7. *c.* 37.

II. But it is true that the neighbouring barbarous Kings often fought againſt the Lamb. *Auſtin* de *Civ. Dei* lib. 18. c. 52. where he confutes thoſe who thought that after the Accompliſhment of the ten Perſecutions which had already been, there was none to come but the

Chapter XVII.

the eleventh, which was to happen in the very time of Antichrist, among other things says this; *Nisi forte non est persequutio computanda, quando Rex Gothorum, in ipsa Gothia, persequutus est Christianos persequutione mirabili, cum ibi non essent Catholici, quorum plurimi martyrio coronati sunt; sicut à quibusdam fratribus, qui tunc illic pueri fuerant, & se ista vidisse incunctanter recordabantur, audivimus. Unless perhaps it is not to be reckon'd a Persecution when the King of the* Goths *strangely persecuted the Christians in* Gothia *it self, because there were not there any Catholicks, of whom a great many were crowned with martyrdom; as we have heard from certain Brethren that were there when Children, and well remembred that they saw those things.* See also *Orosius* in *lib.* 7. *c.* 32. Then of the Conversion of those Northern People, after their Entrance into the *Roman* Empire, and there settling themselves, *Orosius* speaks thus in *lib.* 7. *c.* 41. *Quanquam si ob hoc solum barbari Romanis finibus immissi forent, quod vulgò per Orientem & Occidentem Ecclesiæ Christi, Hunnis, Suevis, Vandalis, & Burgundionibus, diversisque & innumeris credentium populis replentur, laudanda & attollenda Dei misericordia videretur; quandoquidem, etsi cum labefactatione nostri, tantæ gentes agnitionem veritatis acciperent, quam invenire utique, nisi hac occasione, non possent. Tho if it were only for this, that the Barbarians should have been sent into the Roman Borders, that generally the Eastern and Western Churches are filled with Huns, Suevians, Vandals, Burgundians, and a multitude of other different sorts of people, who have embraced the Christian faith, yet we ought to praise and extol the mercy of God; considering that, tho with the weakning of the Empire, so great Nations receive the knowledg of the Truth, which they would never have attained if they had not had this opportunity.*

Vers. 16. *Note* f. There are some faults in this Annotation, which I must correct. I. It is absurdly said by Dr. *Hammond* of *Gensericus*, that he *robb'd the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus* OR *Olympius*. For no body ever called *Jupiter Capitolinus* at Rome *Olympius*, nor is there any such thing in *Procopius*. The Temple of *Jupiter Olympius* was at *Olympia*, not at *Rome*. I might perhaps also say that this is a Fable, and that it is not likely that the Capitolian Temple had stood untouch'd, under so many Christian Emperors. But I leave the matter undecided. II. Our learned Author, having reckon'd *Illyricum* among the provinces which the Barbarians possessed, mentions also *Dalmatia*, which should have been left out; because every one knows that *Dalmatia* is the same Country, which was before called *Illyrieum*. III. After he had spoken of *Totilas*, and referred us for what he had said about *him*, as one would think, to *Sozomen*, lib. ix. c. 6. where that Author speaks of *Alaricus*, he immediately adds: *This being done in the time of Honorius*, making, as the Reader

der might ſuppoſe, *Belliſarius* contemporary with *Honorius*, which he knew to be falſe, but deſigned by the word THIS, tho no body would think ſo, to refer to what he had ſaid *before* the mention of *Totilas* and *Belliſarius*; for the burning of part of *Rome* by *Totilas*, was after the time of *Honorius* and *Innocentius*. IV. A little after he ſays, that *Innocentius* was not at *Rome* (*after the firſt taking of it before the ſecond*) but he would have ſaid *Siege* of it, for he knew that *Alaricus* twice beſieged *Rome*, and took it but once. V. I have ſet down the place cited out of *Oroſius* Lib. vii. c. 38. more at large in my Latin Tranſlation, than it is in the Engliſh; becauſe the words which Dr. *Hammond* omits make more to his purpoſe, than thoſe which he alledges. [And they are theſe:] *Rhadagaiſo Romanis arcibus imminente, ſit omnium Paganorum in urbem concurſus, boſtem eſſe cùm utique virium copia, tum maxime præſidio Deorum potentem; urbem autem ideo deſtitutam & maturè perituram, quia Deos & ſacra perdiderit. Magnis querelis ubique agitur, &* continuo de repetendis ſacris celebrandiſque tractatur; *fervent tota urbe blaſphemiæ, vulgo nomen Chriſti, tanquam lues aliqua, præſentium temporum probris ingravatur. When* Rhadagaſus *drew near the* Roman *Towers, all the Pagans ran together into the City* (crying out) *that an Enemy was come againſt them, who beſides a powerful Army, had alſo the Gods to aſſiſt him; and that the City was deſtitute of all hope, and would ſoon be deſtroyed, becauſe they had loſt the Gods, and forborn to do ſacrifice to them. There were heavy Complaints made in all places, and* preſently they enter'd ——offering them; *all the City was filled with loud Blaſphemies, and the name of Chriſt was reviled and inveighed againſt as ſome preſent Plague.*

Chapter XVIII.

CHAP. XVIII.

Verſ. 2. *Note* a. IT is much more natural to think that the *Jews* groaning under the *Roman* Tyranny, and believing they ſhould be deliver'd from all manner of Evils by the *Meſſias*, did upon that ground conclude that the *Romans* ſhould be deſtroyed by him, that being agreable to their moſt noted ſentiments; than to ſuppoſe, againſt all probability, that they learned it from the Revelation. For nothing is more certain than that the Chriſtians and their Writings were deteſted by the *Jews*. So that what is here ſaid of the perſwaſion of that People, being nothing at all to St. *John*, might have been omitted without any loſs to the Reader.

Verſ. 8. *Note* b. I. If the deſolations that were brought upon *Rome* by *Alaricus Genſericus* and *Totila* be all put together, without doubt the miſery of that City will be the greater; but all theſe are not comprehended

Chapter XVIII.

hended in the Teſtimony of *Palladius*, who ſpeaks only of the ſacking of *Rome* by *Alaricus*, which happen'd *An. Chr.* CCCCX. when *Genſericus* took it in *An. Chr.* CCCCLV. and *Totila An. Chr.* DXLVII. Which times our Author ſhould have diſtinguiſhed, and not ſpoken of them confuſedly.

II. It is true what he ſays about the ſenſe of prophetical Expreſſions, of which ſee the Examples I have alledged on *Rev.* iv. 2. and elſewhere. But he ought not to have ſaid, that after the Prophecies of *Jeremiah*, *the Dominion of* Babylon *was tranſlated to the* Medes, but to the *Perſians*, as every one knows: but the confuſed Memory of the four pretended Monarchies put him out.

Verſ. 13. Our Author took almoſt all this out of *H. Grotius*, as many other things, without ever looking into *Julius Pollux*; by whom he would have ſeen that *Grotius* his Animadverſion was falſe. *Pollux* in Lib. iii. c. 8. S. 2. where he reckons up the names of Slaves, ſays that thoſe were called δοῦλα σώματα which were σὺν ἀργυρίου ἀντικαλλαττόμενα, *changed for Money*; and a little after he ſays: σώματα δ' ἁπλῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποις, ἀλλὰ δοῦλα σώματα: *we muſt not ſay* Bodies *ſimply*, *but* ſervile Bodies. In which he corrects the common, but barbarous Cuſtom of thoſe who called a Slave σῶμα; but he does not ſay that σώματα ἁπλῶς ſignifies Freemen which hire themſelves for Money. It is true indeed that σῶμα is uſed of any Man, whether a Freeman or a Slave, as Lexicographers will ſhew. But when the Diſcourſe is about Wealth, or buying or ſelling Slaves, then σῶμα ſignifies a *Slave*, not from the proper Notion of the word, but becauſe of the Circumſtances. Examples are alledged by *Iſ. Caſaubon* on *Athenæus* Lib. v. c. 10. A hireling was never called σῶμα, and therefore the reaſon of that Appellation, invented by *Grotius*, is groundleſs. But Slaves are ſtiled *Bodies*, when in reckoning up Poſſeſſions men are oppoſed to other things, which do not uſe to be called by that name. They are ſtiled alſo *Souls* by the *Jews*, and by the *Greeks*, becauſe as many Slaves as there are, ſo many Souls there are, or, as the Lawyers ſpeak, *Perſons*. Nor is it any thing againſt this ſignification of the word σώματα, that there are *Souls of Men* afterwards mention'd, which are *Slaves*; for ſuch repetitions are not avoided by theſe Writers.

Verſ. 23. *Note* d. As our Author before raſhly followed *Grotius*, whom he tranſcribed without examination, ſo here he raſhly *forſakes* him. For it is the wealth of the *Romans*, and not that of Strangers, which is extolled in this place. *Grotius* had produced a Paſſage out of *Iſa.* xxiii. 8. where there is the like Phraſe, whom the Reader may conſult.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Chapter XIX.

Verſ. 8. *Note* a. IT is a miſtake that δικαιώματα is uſed in theſe Books for the Ordinances of the Moſaical Law, as I have ſhewn on *Rom.* viii. 4. In this place δικαιώματα ἁγίων are *the Saints righteous Actions*, or κατορθώματα, which are aptly deſcribed by a white Garment, whiteneſs being a Symbol of Innocence. Nothing could be deviſed more violent than Dr. *Hammond*'s interpretation.

Verſ. 20. Εἰς τὴν λίμνην τὴν πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην ἐν τῷ θείῳ.] I have ſaid in my *Diſſertation about the deſtruction of* Sodom, that theſe Phraſes are taken from the Lake *Aſphaltites*, which is a *Lake burning with Fire and Brimſtone*. Which ſeems to have been obſerved alſo by Dr. *Hammond*, as may be gather'd from his Paraphraſe. So it is uſual with the *Rabbins* to baniſh any thing that is abominable, and the uſe of which they think to be profane, *to the ſalt Sea*, לים המלח, as is obſerved by Mr. *Lightfoot* Cent. Chorog. on *Mat.* Cap. v.

CHAP. XX.

Chapter XX.

Verſ. 5. *Note* b. I Confeſs indeed ingenuouſly I do not underſtand the ſenſe of this Prophecy, concerning the Perſons here mention'd, *reigning a thouſand Years:* But notwithſtanding that I could, if I pleaſed, confute what is here ſaid by Dr. *Hammond*. He will never perſwade any one who believes that Chriſt and his Apoſtles were the only *arbitrary* (αὐτοσχέδιοι) founders and interpreters of the Chriſtian Religion, that for a thouſand Years after *Conſtantin* the Church was purer than it was before; or that there were fewer falſe Doctrins by publick Authority, eſtabliſh'd in many Churches. In that interval of time there were not only many Hereſies, which created almoſt perpetual differences, but very great Errors crept in among Chriſtians, which were openly approved by the Governors of Churches; ſo that the Church-Diſcipline which our Author ſo much boaſts of, was uſed only to confirm thoſe Errors, and with the conſent of Princes, to kill, or at leaſt abuſe thoſe who dared to oppoſe them. So that if this Kingdom be to be extended to the thouſand following Years, it muſt not be thought conſiſt in ſanctity of Life, and purity of Doctrin; but only in the Liberty which the Chriſtians ſhould enjoy, in the greateſt part of the Roman Empire, ſo that they might be good and pious Men, without being envied or perſecuted by the Heathens.

Chapter XX.

Verſ. 7. *Note* e. I. I wonder our learned Author here took ſo much pains to confute very weak Objections, and yet took no notice of the Hereſies which diſturbed the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches at the time when he ſuppoſes the Chriſtians reigned; as I have before obſerved.

II. He takes it for certain that not only *Alaricus* ſpared the Chriſtians, and deſtroyed none but Heathens, but alſo that *Genſericus* and *Attila* did the ſame, which he does not prove. This ſhould have been ſhewn, and not that which he proves of *Julian* in ſo many words, when no one can deny it, who has read any thing of the Hiſtory of thoſe times.

III. I confeſs I don't approve of the opinion of the Millenaries, but I wonder Dr. *Hammond* here objects againſt them the condemnation of the Church, and gives them the odious name of Hereticks. For as that is but a ſmall Error, if the reſt of the Doctrins of Chriſtianity be retain'd, as they were by *Irenæus*; ſo the *Church* had not received any Revelation about that matter from the times of the Apoſtles.

Verſ. 8. *Note* f. I. That *Gog* and *Magog* ſignify the People who dwelt about the Mountain *Caucaſus*, has been ſo clearly ſhewn by *Sam. Bochart* Geogr. Sacr. Lib. iii. c. 12. that it is impoſſible to doubt of it. And the *Turks* having invaded *Aſia* from thoſe places, our Author might hence have confirmed his Interpretation; which I wonder he did not, ſeeing he alledges that Writer elſewhere. For what is ſaid here by *Grotius*, cannot in the leaſt be compared with what we may learn from *Bochart*, as to this matter.

II. It is true indeed that *Gyges* was ſometime Ruler of *Lydia*; but the Kings which ſucceeded him were not therefore, as I remember, called *Gygæ*; tho it be affirmed by *Grotius*, and after him by Dr. *Hammond*, who abſurdly deduces it from this place, whereas *Gyges* and his Poſterity were in part antienter than *Ezekiel*, and partly his Contemporaries: and therefore ſure that name could not be taken from the *Revelation*.

III. If the Empire of the *Turks* be here referred to, I had rather interpret *the beloved City*, and *the Camp of the Saints*, of all the Eaſtern Church, than *Conſtantinople* alone. But *verſ.* 9. ſeems to oppoſe it, in which a ſudden Victory over *Gog* and *Magog* ſeems rather to be promiſed, than the taking of that City by thoſe People threatned. Yet this, and all other things of that kind, I leave undetermin'd.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Verſ. 4. Ὅτι πένθος.] *Cicero* Tuſcul. Quæſt. Lib. ii. c. 15. having defined *labor* and *dolor*, *Labour* and *Sorrow*, adds; *hæc duo, Græci illi, quorum copioſior eſt lingua quam noſtra, uno nomine appellant*; *Theſe two things, the* Grecians, *whoſe Language is more copious than ours, call by one name.* He means the word πένθος, as what he ſays afterwards, as well as the thing it ſelf ſhews. So in *Epictetus* Enchir. Cap. xiv. Ἐὰν πένθος παρῇ σοι, ἀθέλητος χαρτεία: *If Sorrow preſent it ſelf, you will find patience.* In this place alſo *Sorrow* ſeems to be intended.

Verſ. 12. Ἀγγέλους δώδεκα.] Theſe words ſeem alſo to ſignify the Apoſtles, as may be gather'd both from the number here ſpecified, and from this, that by them all Nations enter'd into the Church. If this and the like things be to be applied to the Church in later times, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks, it muſt be remember'd that the praiſes here given to it, muſt be underſtood comparatively, ſo as for that Church to be oppoſed to the Jews and Heathens, in compariſon of which it is not unworthy of theſe Commendations. But we muſt not meaſure its Doctrins or Practices by the perfect Rule of the Goſpel, from which Dr. *Hammond* himſelf did not think but it had departed, tho he would not acknowledg it.

Verſ. 16. Τὸ βάθος.] To wit, from the bottom of the Mountain on which the City ſtood, to the top of its Walls; for the Walls themſelves were not ſo very high. It is ſomewhat uncertain whether all the ſides of this Square were twelve thouſand Furlongs in length, ſo as that the whole Circuit was forty eight thouſand Furlongs; as alſo the height of the Mountain joined with the height of the Walls; or whether a fourth part only of that number is to be aſſigned to each of the ſides, that is, three thouſand Furlongs. The former is moſt likely, ſo as that an exceeding great City ſhould be deſcribed, nothing but what is great and ſpacious being here to be thought on.

Verſ. 17. *Note* f. By a *man's Cubit* here, I rather underſtand an ordinary Cubit, as in *Deut.* iii. 11. where without doubt *Moſes* ſpeaks of a Cubit of ſix handbreadths. In *Ezekiel* alſo the Diſcourſe is not about a Cubit of a Foot, but of ſix handbreadths, as is evident from *verſ.* 5. Chap. xl. where the Angel is ſaid to have had in his hand a *meaſuring Reed of ſix Cubits, by the Cubit, and an handbreadth*, that is; ſix Jewiſh, not Babylonian Cubits. See Dr. *Cumberland* of the Jewiſh Meaſures.

Chapter XXII.

CHAP. XXII.

Verſ. 1. IT was ſufficient to ſay, that by the Authority of the *Note* a. Lamb ſitting upon his Throne, Baptiſm was inſtituted; which is very true, and is here ſignified, granting that the Water in Baptiſm is meant by the *Water proceeding out of the Throne.* The reſt Dr. *Hammond* adds of his own Invention, to find out here the power of the Keys, as he does in other places, where no one elſe would think them referred to. The ſame he does afterwards, but being in haſt to make an end of this tedious work, I ſhall not particularly examin what he ſays, nor would it be worth while. For who but he could here miſtake? He deſcribes to us, for inſtance, the happy Condition of the Chriſtians from *Conſtantin*, to the Year MCCC. living under the Diſcipline of Church-Governors, and a moſt pure Church during that interval, and moſt worthy of Chriſt. Which that we might believe, either the New Teſtament muſt have been many Ages ago loſt, or no footſteps at all of the Hiſtory of thoſe times remained. Our learned Author was taken up about ſomething elſe when he wrote this, and whilſt he ſerved an Hypotheſis, committed to writing what was inconſiſtent with his ſtated Sentiments.

Verſ. 3. *Note* e. If *allegorical Divinity were argumentative*, as the Schoolmen ſpeak, poſſibly ſome or other might be deceived by theſe allegorical Interpretations, and think that Chriſt approved of all the Excommunications that were denounced by Church-Governors, from the time of *Conſtantin*, for ten Ages; but that Axiom of the Schoolmen being very well known, I ſhall not ſpend time in confuting our Author's Fictions, which the thing it ſelf alſo abundantly confutes.

FINIS.

An INDEX

Of the Greek Words and Phrases, newly or more largely explained in the Supplement to Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations.

A.

Ἀγαθὸς, *bountiful*, Rom. v. 7.

Διὰ τὸς Ἀγγέλυς, perhaps for διὰ τῆς Ἀγγελίας, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Ἅδης, whether it signifies *the state of the Dead*, or rather *a place*? Mat. xi. 23.

Ἀδιάκριτος, whether *one that doth not doubt*, or *one that makes no difference*, Jam. iii. 17.

Ἀδόκιμος, in an Active sense for *one that cannot try things*, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

Ἀδύνατον, for *that which is very difficult*, Heb. vi. 6.

Ἀθετῶν νόμον, *to reject the Law*, Heb. x. 28.

Αἰγιαλὸς, for *a sandy*, or *gravelly Shore*, Acts xxvii. 39.

Αἰρετικὸς, properly, who? *Tit.* iii. 10.

ἀυτοκατάκριτος, who. *Ibid.* 11.

Αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα, a Phrase borrowed from the *Stoicks*, Heb. v. 14.

Αἰῶνες of the *Gnosticks*, whence so called, 1 *Tim.* i. 15.

Αἰώνιος, for *eternal*, and for *antient*, Tit. i. 2.

Αἰῶν ὁ συντέλια, the different senses of which that Phrase is capable, *Mat.* xxiv. 3.

Ἀκάθαρτος, applied to the Heathens, signifies, *their being out of God's Covenant*, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Ἀκέραιος, whether *one that does no hurt*, or *that is sincere*, Mat. 10. 16.

Ἀκρασία, & Ἀκρατὴς, *one that has no command over himself*, 1 Cor. vii. 5.

Δι' Ἀκροβυστίας, *among the uncircumcised Gentiles*, Rom. ii. 27. and iv. 11.

Ἀκροθίνια, the first fruits taken off the tops of *spoils*, or any other things heaped together, *Heb.* vii. 4. p. 951.

Ἀλάσσειν, whence derived and what? *Matt.* xxvi. 7.

Ἀλγέω, not *to be cold*, but *to grieve*, 2 Cor. iv. 8. *Eph.* iv. 19.

Ἁλίζομαι, *to be salted*, and *to be consumed*, in *Mar.* ix. 49.

Ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, for *a seditious* Person, 1 *Pet.* iv. 15.

Ἀλλότριον, for what cannot always be enjoyed, or belongs not to the Mind, in a Philosophical sense, *Luke* xvi. 12.

Ἄλογος, whether to be taken actively, or passively, 2 *Pet.* ii. 12.

Ἁμαρτία πρὸς θανάτον, what, 1 *Joh.* v. 16.

Ἀναγκάζειν, to *compel*, by example or entreaty, *Gal.* ii. 14.

Ἀναγλυφαία, of the *Athletæ*, what, 1 *Cor.* ix. 25.

Ἀνακαινίζειν, *to renew*, not *to dedicate*, Heb. vi. 6.

Ἀναλογία πίστεως, *the measure of Faith*, Rom. xii. 6.

Ἀναλύειν, *to return*, Philip. i. 23. ἀναλυτικὴ, a method so called, which, *Ibid.*

Ἀνάστασις, whether it ever signifies in Scripture, simply *a second state*, or only *the resurrection of the Dead*, Mat. xxii. 31. *Luke* xx. 27.

Ἀνθρωπὸν λέγω, what, *Rom.* vi. 19.

Ἀντὶ, signifies a Substitution, where the Discourse is about the Death of Christ, *Mat.* xx. 28.

Ἀντιτυπεῖν, *to resist*, not *to imitate*, 1 John ii. 18.

Ἀντίτυπος, what, *Heb.* ix. 24.

Ἀντίχειρ,

Ἀντίχειθ, what it signifies, 1 *John* ii. 18.

Ἀπάγξασθαι, whether it signifies *a suffocation* arising from Melancholy, or only violent *strangling*, Mat. xxvii. 5.

Ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, *the brightness of the glory* of God, how Christ is said to be so, *Heb.* i. 3.

Ἀπειθεῖν, *to disobey*, applied either to small or heinous Sins, 1 *Pet.* iii. 20.

Ἁπλότης, *liberality* why so called, *Rom.* xii. 8.

Ἁπλοῦς, *liberal*, applied to the Eye, *Mat.* vi. 22.

Ἀπιλογικότος, who, *Rom.* i. 29. *Eph.* iv. 19.

Ἀπὸ, to be understood, *Gal.* i. 1.

Ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, *from the Creation of the World*, Rom. i. 20.

Ἀποδέχεσθαι, *to approve*, 1 Tim. i. 15.

Ἀποδοχὴ, *approbation*, Ibid.

Ἀποκαραδοκία, *the expectation* of the *Gentiles*, of what kind, *Rom.* viii. 19.

Ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, *the restitution of all things*, Acts iii. 19.

Ἀποστασία, *a departure*, *a revolt*, signifies the rebellion of the *Jews* against the *Romans*, 2 Thess. ii. 3.

Ἀποστερεῖν, *to defraud*, Mar. x. 19.

Ἀπόστολ, whether the name imports any Authority or Dignity, *Luke* vi. 13. who were so called, *Prem.* to *James*.

Ἀποσυνάγωγ, *cast out of the Congregation*, John ix. 22.

Ἀργὸν ῥῆμα, *a word* either *reproachful*, or *which tends to corrupt* the Manners of Men, *Mat.* xii. 36.

Ἀργὸς, *Idle*, not *Unclean*, Tit. i. 12.

Ἀρεστὸν, *that which pleases*, John viii. 29.

Ἀρεοπαγίτης, whence so called, *Acts* xvii. 19.

Ἀρνεῖσθαι, *to disowne*, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

Ἄρπαξ, who, 1 *Cor.* v. 10.

Ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσασθαι, what, *Phil.* ii. 6.

Ἅρτι & ἀρτίζειν, what, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11.

Τὴν Ἀρχὴν, the meaning of that Phrase, *John* viii. 25.

Ἀρχισυνάγωγος, who, *Mat.* v. 22.

Ἀσσάριον, of *Tiberius*, how much, *Mat.* x. 29.

Ἀσθένεια & ἀσθενὴς, to signify a Disease of the Mind, 1 *Cor.* viii. 7.

Ἀταξῶς περιπατεῖν, what, 2 *Thess.* iii. 6.

Ἄτοπ, *wicked*, 2 Thess. iii. 2.

Αὐστηρὸς, *covetous*, Luke xix. 21.

Ἀφ' ἧς, whether it signifies *except that*, 2 Pet. iii. 4.

Ἀφανίζειν, what, *Mat.* vi. 16.

Ἀφὴν to be joined with λατρεύειν, *Luke* i. 73.

Ἀφροσύνη, not *boasting*, but *imprudence*, Mar. vii. 22. several significations of that word, *Ibid.*

Ἄχυρον, not *the straw of Corn*, but *the Husk*, Mat. iii. 12.

B.

Ἐν Βάρει εἶναι, whether it signifies, *to be severe*, 1 Thess. ii. 6.

Βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων, why God is so called, 1 *Tim.* i. 17.

Βδέλυγμα, *an abominable thing*, 1 Cor. v. 10. p. 316.

Βραχύ τι, whether it signify *a little while*, in *Heb.* ii. 7.

Γ.

Γαστριμαργία, *intemperance in eating*, its derivation, *Tit.* i. 12.

Γίνεσθαι, applied to a Law, signifies its continuing in force, *Mat.* v. 18.

Γένεσις, the *origin of a thing*, not taken for *any event*, Mat. i. 1.

Γλῶσσαι, for strange *Languages*, 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Γνῶσις, for a profound sort of *Knowledg*, and in a good sense, 2 *Pet.* i. 5.

Γνῶσις Ψευδώνυμος, whether it has any reference to the *Gnosticks*, 1 *Tim.* vi. 20.

Κατὰ Γνῶσιν, *prudently*, or *skilfully*, 1 Pet. iii. 7.

Γράμμα, for the literal sense of the Law. *Mat.* v. 17.

Δ.

Δαιμόνια, not always *evil Spirits*, 1 Cor. x. 20.

Δὲ for γὰρ, Jam. i. 9. p. 574.

Δέχεσθαι, *to assent to*, 1 Cor. ii. 14.

Διὰ for *in*, 1 *Tim.* ii. 15.

Διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *as a Disciple of Christ*, Rom. i. 8.

Διάβολ, *an Adversary* or *Hater*, Mat. iv. 1.

Διαθήκη, an ambiguous word, *Annot.* on the *Tit.* of *the New Teſtament*, and *Heb.* ix. 16. where there is an Argument grounded on the ambiguity of it.

Διάκονοι, from διακονεῖν, who. *Luke* viii. 2.

Διάκονος, ſpoken of a Woman, what. *Rom.* xvi. 1.

Διακρίνειν σῶμα Κυρίου, what. 1 *Cor.* xi. 29.

Διακρίνεσθαι, *to diſtinguiſh*, James ii. 4.

Διαλογισμοὶ, *Thoughts* and *Counſels*, Mat. xv. 19. *Opinions* in *Rom.* xiv. 1.

Διανύειν πλοῦν, *to finiſh a Voyage*, Act. xxi. 7.

Διαπρίεσθαι, *to gnaſh with the Teeth*, Acts v. 33.

Διστάζειν, *to doubt*: and δίψυχος ἀνὴρ, *a Man that doubteth*, James i. 6, 8.

Διδάσκαλοι, under the New Teſtament, who, and how they differ'd from Prophets, 1 *Cor.* xii. 28.

Δικαιοῦν, St. *Paul*'s ſenſe of it, *Rom.* iii. 4.

Δικαίωμα, any divine Precept, *Rom.* ii. 26. and viii. 4.

Δικαιώματα ἁγίων, what, *Rev.* xix. 8.

Δίκη, the ſame with *Nemeſis*, Acts xxviii. 4.

Δοκιμάζειν, *to examin* and *approve*, Rom. ii. 18.

Δόξα, for *Miracles*, John i. 14. and the Power of working them, *Ib.* xvii. 22. whether taken for *a Beam* in 1 *Cor.* xi. 7.

Δόξας βλασφημεῖν, what, *Jude* 8.

Δοῦλοι, for Servants *of a free Condition*, in oppoſition to *Slaves*, Mat. xviii. 23.

Δυσωπεῖν Θεὸν, *to prevail with God*, Luke xviii. 5.

E.

Εγγαστρίμυθος, what Woman, *Acts* xvi. 16.

Εγγίζειν, in Holy things, what, *Heb.* vii. 19.

Εγκράτεια, a power over a Man's ſelf: ἐγκρατὴς, one that is maſter of his Paſſions: ἐγκρατεύεσθαι, to be Temperate, 1 *Cor.* ix. 25. p. 319.

Ἐθελοθρησκία, uſed in a bad ſenſe by St. *Paul*, Col. ii. 19.

Ἔθνη, for the Inhabitants of ſeveral Territories in the ſame Country, *Mat.* xxiv. 7.

Εἰδωλα, the Gods of the Heathens, whence ſo called, 1 *Cor.* viii. 4.

Εἰκάλλειν ὄνειμα, whether it ſignifies *to excommunicate*, Luke vi. 22.

Ἐκκλησία, the uſe of the word in the Primitive Times, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 19.

Ἐκλεκτὴ, whether taken for a Church, 2 *John* 1.

Ἐκτίθεσθαι, *to declare*, Act. xxviii. 23. p. 243.

Ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων, *by* or *from many*, 2 Cor. i. 11.

Ἐκχεῖσθαι ἐν πλάνῃ, what, *Jud.* 11.

Ἔλεγχος, whether *a Perſwaſion*, or *an Argument*, Heb. xi. 1.

Ἔμπυρον, *a burnt Sacrifice*, Mark ix. 49.

Ἐμφανίζειν, *to accuſe*, Acts xxiv. 1.

Ἔμφυτος λόγος, a word which ſinks down into the minds of its Hearers, *Jam.* i. 21.

Ενεργεῖσθαι, taken both Actively and Paſſively, *Gal.* v. 6. where the *Doctor*'s Opinion about the uſe of it in the New Teſtament is examin'd.

Ἐξαπορεῖσθαι, *to deſpair utterly*, 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Ἔξοδος, to ſignify the Coming of Chriſt to take Vengeance upon the *Jews*, Luk. ix. 31.

Ἐξομολογεῖν, *to agree about the price* of a thing, *Luke* xxii. 6.

Ἔξουσία, for *a Veil*, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Επίλυσις, whether to be rendred, *ſending out*, or *looſing*, 2 Pet. i. 20.

Ἐπιθυμία, any *Luſt* whatſoever, 2 *Pet.* i. 4.

Επίσιος, *that which is neceſſary for the future*, Mat. vi. 11.

Ἐπισκοπὴ, *viſitation*, either in Mercy or in Vengeance, 1 *Pet.* ii. 12. p. 589.

Ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to look into*, or underſtand throughly, 1 *Pet.* ii. 12.

Ἐργάζεσθαι βιωσιν, *to get his Living by Labour*, John vi. 27.

Ἐχάτη ἡμέρα, the ſame as *hereafter*, 2 Pet. iii. 3.

Ἔτερος ζυγὸν ἀπίστοις, what, 2 *Cor.* vi. 14.

Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, *to receive a gracious Promiſe*, Heb. iv. 2.

Ευγένεια, what diſpoſition of Mind, *Acts* xvii. 11.

Εὐπερίσατος, *that is eaſily circumvented*, not *joined with Temptations*, Heb. xii. 1.

Εὐοδοῦσθαι, *happened*, Mat. i. 18.

Εὐοχλοῦντας, for Εὐοχαιροῦντας, Acts xxvii. 14

Εὐτραπελία, a cleanly word for *obſcene Diſcourſe*, Eph. v. 4.

Ἔχθρος

Ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, not the Devil, but a Man, in Mat. xiii. 28.
Ἕως, uſed as an Adverſative, Mat. v. 18.

Z.

Ζημιῶδαι, with an Accuſative caſe, no Elliptical Phraſe, Mat. xvi. 26.
Ζῶα γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν, what, 1 Cor. v. 10.

H.

Ἢ, when a Negation goes before it, the ſame as nor, Eph. v. 3.

Θ.

Θέλω, for I would, Rom. vii. 15. for I had rather, 1 Cor. vii. 6.
Θεμέλιον, the ſame as Κεφάλαιον, and perhaps to be ſo read, 1 Tim. vi. 19.
Θεοφύλακτος, preſerved by God, not, one that defends God, 1 Tim. ii. 1.

I.

Ἰδιώτης λόγῳ, how St. Paul confeſſes himſelf to be ſo, 2 Cor. xi. 6.
Ἱλαστήριον, what, Rom. iii. 25.
Ἱλεώς σοι, the meaning of that Phraſe, Mat. xvi. 22.
Ἱμάτιον, a Cloak, Mat. v. 40.
Ἴσα Θεῷ εἶναι, to be made equal with God, Phil. ii. 6.

K.

Καθαίρεσις, alone, not properly Excommunication but degrading from Office, καθαίρεσις ὀχυρώματος, the deſtroying a Fence, not the excommunicating an obdurate Sinner, 2 Cor. x. 4.
Καιρὸς σύκων, what, Mat. xi. 13.
Καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, which, Luke xxi. 24.
Καλὸς καλῶς ἀπολλύειν, a Proverb, Mat. xxi. 41.
Κάμηλος, a Cable, Mat. xix. 24.
Κάμνειν, properly to be tired, metaphorically, to faint or fail, Heb. xii. 3.
Καρπὸς, whether it ever ſignifies a Burnt-offering: καρπὸς χειλέων, whether applicable to the Oblations of Chriſtians at the Euchariſt, Heb. xiii. 2.
Κατὰ πίστιν, whether by Works, or in the judgment of Man, Rom. iv. 1.
Καταβραβεύειν, to be deceived, Col. ii. 18.
Καταγινώσκειν, whether it ever ſignifies to diſcover, Gal. ii. 11.
Καταλαμβάνειν, whether an Agoniſtical term, Phil. iii. 12. p. 458.
Καταλύειν, to bait or lodg, Luke ix. 12.
Καταναρκᾶν, to be burdenſome, how ſo, 2 Cor. xi. 9.
Κατάνυξις, compunction, and ſlumbering, Rom. xi. 8.
Καταργεῖν σῶμα ἁμαρτίας, to mortify Sins ariſing from the Body, Rom. vi. 6.
Καταρτίζειν, how variouſly taken in the New Teſtament, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
Καταρτισμὸς, to mould or form, and κατάρτισις, forming, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
Κατάστημα, whether the Rank of ſuch as are ordained Miniſters, or rather a dreſs of any ſort, Tit. ii. 3.
Κατατομὴ, applied by way of contempt to thoſe who boaſted of Circumciſion, περιτομὴ, Phil. iii. 2.
Τὸ Κατέχον, what, 2 Theſſ. ii. 6.
Κατισχύειν, to overcome by force, Mat. xvi. 18.
Κενὸς, whether it ſignifies falſe, 1 Theſſ. ii. 1.
Κεραννύειν, for to pour in, Rev. xiv. 10.
Κεχαριτωμένη, whether full of Grace, or ſingularly favour'd by God, Luke i. 28.
Κλαίειν, whether to cry out, Mat. viii. 12.
Κλῆσις, the Doctor's Opinion of the uſe of that word in Scripture examin'd, Mat. xx. 16. πολλοὶ εἰσὶ κλητοὶ, ſpoken of whom, and what it ſignifies, Ib. xxii. 14.
Κοιλία, for the Stomach, Rev. x. 9.
Κοινὸς, Unclean, Mark vii. 2.
Κοινωνία πνεύματος, what, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
Κοσμικὸς, for earthly, Heb. ix. 1.
Κόπτεσθαι & σύρειν, words ſignifying the ſame thing, Mat. xvi. 10.
Κρέμασθαι [ἐπὶ τινὸς] to hang upon a thing, ſpoken of the Law, the ground of the expreſſion, Mat. xxii. 40.
Κεκοιμῆσθαι σαρκὶ, what, 1 Pet. iv. 6.
Κρῖμα μεῖζον λαμβάνειν, what, Jam. iii. 1.
Ὁ Κρίνων, one that judgeth of Good and Evil, Rom. ii. 1.
Κριτήριον, for a Judgment, 1 Cor. vi. 2.
Κτισθῆναι πάντα, how they are ſaid to have been ſo by Chriſt, Col. i. 16.
Κυβεία, Divination by Lots, Eph. iv. 14.

A.

Ἀκλεὶν ἐνέγκαμα, what, *Jude* 16.

Λόγοι, ſet ſimply where γεγραπ is underſtood, *Eph.* v. 14.

Λόγια, *Oracles*, whence ſo called, *Rom.* iii. 2. λόγια ζῶντα, what, *Ibid.*

Λόγος, the Divine Reaſon, *prem.* to *John* i. for *Knowledg*, 1 Cor. i. 5. for *Report*, 1 Theſſ. ii. 5. for *the Goſpel*, Luke i. 2. joined with Θεοῦ, for *God* himſelf in *Heb.* iv. 12.

Λοιδορῶ, whether it ſignifies *Luſtful*, 1 Cor. v. 11.

Λυπεῖσθαι, *to be grieved*, ſo as to become diſaffected to Chriſtianity, *Rom.* xiv. 15. whether it ever ſignifies *Excommunication*, 2 Cor. vii. 8. 9.

M.

Ματαιότης, whether it ſignifies *Idolatry* or *Vanity*, Rom. viii. 20.

Μελετᾶν, *to mind*, or *take care of*, 1 Tim. iv. 10.

Ἐν Μέσῃ ἑορτῇ, what. *Col.* ii. 16.

Μεριζω, *to diſtract*, 1 Cor. vii. 34.

Ἐν Μέσῳ Θρόνου, for, *over againſt the midſt of the Throne*, Rev. iv. 6.

Μεταλαμβάνειν εὐλογίας, for *to uſe a Bleſſing*, Heb. vi. 7.

Μετάνοια, whether ever taken in the New Teſtament for *Church Penalties*, Heb. vi. 6.

Μογιλάλος, whether it ſignifies *Dumb*, Mar. vi. 32.

Μορφὴ Θεοῦ, and μορφὴ δούλου, what, *Phil.* ii. 6. 7.

Municipium & *Municipatus* in Lat. what, *Phil.* iii. 20.

Μυσὸς, who, 1 *Tim.* ii. 1.

Μυσέιον, whether it ſignify any thing indecent, *Rev.* xvii. 5.

Μωσαϊκὸν, his Office among the Jews, *Heb.* iv. 13.

Μωρολογία, for obſcene Diſcourſe, *Eph.* v. 4.

N.

Νάρδος πιστικὴ, *Nard faithfully prepared*, Mar. xiv. 3. p. 115.

Νεωκόρος, a common title of the Cities in *Aſia*, Acts xix. 35.

Νεώτεροι, whether applied to Chriſtians that have no Office in the Church, *Luke* xxii. 26. and *Tit.* ii. 2.

Εἰς Νῖκος, *in victory*, *one for ever*, 1 Cor. xv. 54.

Νομὸς ἐπέων, *a profuſion of words*, 2 Tim. ii. 16.

Νῦς, for *the meaning* or *ſenſe* of words, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 14. for *quickneſs of Wit*, or *Underſtanding*, Phil. iv. 7.

O.

Οἰκία τῦ σκήνος, *a Houſe* in the likeneſs *of a Tabernacle* eaſily diſſolved, 2 *Cor.* v. 1.

Κατ' Οἶκον, *from houſe to houſe*, Acts ii. 46.

Ὀχληθὲς, *whom it grieveth* to do any thing, *Phil.* iii. 1.

Ὅλως, an Adverb of *affirming*, or *in few words*, 1 Cor. v. 1.

Ἐν Ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, to *carry himſelf like a common Man*, Phil. ii. 7.

Ὄνομα, for a *Perſon*, Acts i. 15.

Ὁμολογεῖται ὑὸς Θεῦ, how Chriſt is ſaid to have been ſo, *Rom.* i. 4.

Ὀστράκινα σκεύη, *earthen Veſſels*, 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Ὅτι, whether an Expletive, *Mat.* vii. 23. for *how*, Mar. vi. 2.

Οὖν, the beginning of an *Apodoſis*, Jam. iii. 5.

Ὄφελον, for Ὠφελον, Gal. v. 12.

Π.

Παγκράτιον, what ſort of Exerciſe, 1 *Cor.* ix. 26.

Παιδίον, for *a Servant*, Luke xi. 7.

Παλιγγενεσία, a Philoſophical word, ſignifying the *reſtoration* of all things, *Mat.* xix. 28.

Πανοπλία, *heavy Armour*, Eph. vi. 11, 15.

Παραδειγματίζειν, *to puniſh*, among the antient Greeks; *to traduce*, among the later, *Mat.* i. 19.

Παραδιδόναι, whether it ſignifies *to excommunicate*, Tit. iii. 10.

Παράκλητος, in what ſenſe uſed by Chriſt, *John* xiv. 16.

Παρασκευὴ, *Friday*, Mar. xv. 42.

Παρατηρεῖν, in an ill ſenſe, *Luke* xx. 20.

Πάρεσις, *Remiſſion*, Rom. iii. 25.

Παροιμία σοφὴ, an ambiguous expreſſion, 1 *Pet.* iv. 1.

Πείθειν, whether it ever ſignifies *to pacify*, 2 Cor. v. 11. and *Gal.* i. 10. πείθειν καρδίαν ἑαυτῦ, an Elliptical Phraſe, 1 *John* iii. 19.

Περιΐστημι, *to avoid*, 2 Tim. ii. 16.

Περικάθαρμα, *the offscouring, a contemptible Person*, 1 Cor. iv. 13.
Περίοχὴ, *a period*, Acts viii. 32.
Περίψημα, i. q. περικάθαρμα, q. v.
Πέτρος & Πέτρος, the same, *Mat.* x. 2.
Πίστις, *Faith*, several Notions of it, *Mat.* viii. 10. for *a certain knowledg*, Rom. xiv. 23. and 1 *Thess.* iii. 10.
Πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, what, *John* ii. 23.
Πλεονεξία, whether it signifies *unnatural Lusts*, Rom. i. 29. *Eph.* v. 3.
Πλεονεκτεῖσθαι, several senses of it. *Luk.* i. 12.
Πλήρωμα, *a multitude*, Rom. xi. 12.
Πνεῦμα, for the *design* of the Lawgiver in opposition to the *Letter* of the Law, *Mat.* v. 17. *Rom.* ii. 29. and vii. 5. 2 *Cor.* iii. 6. for the miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost, 1 *Cor.* ii. 4. for the *mind* of Man distinct from the *Body*, 1 Cor. xiv. 14. πνεῦμα δειλίας, what, *Rom.* viii. 15. πνεύματι λαλεῖν, what, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 2. *p.* 356. πνεύματα ἐν φυλακῇ, *the Spirits that watch*, 1 Pet. iii. 10.
Πνευματικὸς, for *supernatural*, 1 Cor. x. 3.
Πνίγειν, to drag along by head and shoulders, *Mat.* xviii. 28.
Ποίημα, *a work*, Rom. i. 20.
Πολιτεία, *the privilege of Citizen*, Phil. iii. 20.
Πολίτευμα, *a City*, Heb.
Πόνος, *Grief*, Rev. xxi. 4.
Πραιτώριον, what, *Phil.* i. 13.
Πρεσβύτης & πρεσβύτερος, used promiscuously, to signify either *Dignity* or *Age*, Tit. ii. 2.
Προβάλλειν, *to push forward*, or *lead to Judgment*, Acts xix. 33.
Προγεγραμμένοι εἰς κρῖμα, who, *Jud.* 4.
Πρόγραμμα & προγράφειν, what, *Jud.* 4.
Πρόθεσις, *a purpose of Mind*; κατὰ πρόθεσιν, agreably to such a purpose, *Rom.* viii. 28.
Προσωπόλαβεῖν τῷ νῷ, what, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 4.
Προσκυνεῖν signifies both *divine* and *civil Worship*, Mat. ii. 9.
Προσφορὰ & θυσία, whether they differ, *Eph.* v. 2.
Πρόσφαγον, for that which may be converted into Food, *John* xxi. 5.
Πρόσωπον γενέσεως, *the natural Countenance*, James i. 23.
Πρόφασις, *a Cause* true or pretended, 1 *Thess.* ii. 5.
Πρωτεύειν, Dr. *Hammond*'s opinion about the various senses of that word examin'd, *Luke* i. 67.
Πρῶτος, *superior*, John i. 15.
Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, what, *Col.* i. 15.
Πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, how the Law of *Moses* is so called, *Gal.* iv. 9.
Πυγμῇ βαπτίζεσθαι, among the *Jews*, what, *Mar.* vii. 2.
Πύλαι ᾅδου, what, *Mat.* xvi. 18.
Πνεύμα Πύθωνος, what, *Acts* xvi. 16.

P.

Ῥαδιουργία, *Deceit*, Acts xiii. 50.
Ῥοιζηδὸν, *with a rattling noise*, 2 Pet. iii. 10.

Σ.

Σίβασμα, a very fit word to express the Hebrew *Elohim*, 2 Thess. ii. 3.
Σεισμὸς, *a concussion in the Air*, Mat. xxviii. 2.
Σημαίνεσθαι, whether it signifies *to brand* by Excommunication, 2 *Thess.* iii. 14.
Σκία, *a rough Picture*, Heb. viii. 5.
Σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκὶ, what, 2 *Cor.* xii. 7.
Σπήλαιον, what, *Luke* xix. 20.
Σπιλοῦσθαι, *to be slain*, applied to a Sacrifice, 2 *Tim.* iv. 6.
Στέλλεσθαι, whether *to excommunicate*, or only *to withdraw himself*, 2 Thess. iii. 6.
Στοιχεῖον, for *a Shadow*, Col. ii. 9.
Στολαὶ, long Robes, *Luke* xx. 46.
Στρατεύειν, whether it be *to serve*, Luke xxiii. 11.
Στρατηγὸς ἱερῶν, of two sorts, *Luke* xxii. 52. *Acts* iv. 1. and v. 24.
Συγκεκραμένον λόγῳ, what *word*, Heb. iv. 2.
Συμπρεσβύτερος, why St. *Peter* calls himself, 1 *Pet.* v. 1.
Συνείδησις εἰδώλου, what, 1 *Cor.* viii. 7.
Συνοικεῖν, sometimes signifies all conjugal Offices, 1 *Pet.* iii. 7.
Συντηρεῖν, *to preserve*, Mar. vi. 20.
Συντρίβειν σκεῦος, *to break a Vessel*, not *to shake* it, *Mar.* xiv. 3.
Σφραγὶς, *a sign*, Rom. iv. 11.
Σχῆμα, *an outward appearance*, Phil. ii. 8.
Σῴζειν, taken for several things, *Luke* xiii. 23.
Σῶμα μοῦ, whether it signifies *my self*, Rom. vi. 6. 1 *Cor.* ix. 27.

Σῶμα ἁμαρτίας, whether *Sin*, or a Body obnoxious to Sin, *Rom.* vi. 6.

Σώματα, for *Slaves*, not *Hirelings*, Rev. xviii. 13.

Σωτηρία, for *eternal Salvation*, not *a temporal Deliverance* from Perſecutions, *Heb.* ii. 3.

T.

Ταμεῖα, *ſecret Chambers*, Mat. xxiv. 26.

διὰ Τεχνολογίας σωθήναι, what, 1 *Tim.* ii. 15.

Τελειότης, for a ſort of *Perfection*, which is only ornamental, *Heb.* vi. 1.

Τελειῶν, *to conſecrate*, not to *make perfect*, Heb. ii. 10.

Τελειοῦσθαι, whether an Agoniſtical term, *Phil.* iii. 12.

Τελειωθῆναι, to enjoy perfect Happineſs, *Heb.* xi. 40.

Τελείωσις, the *Conſecration* of any one that offer'd Sacrifice, *Heb.* vii. 11.

Τελῶναι, of two ſorts, *Mat.* xi. 19.

Τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, who, *Acts* xiii. 48.

Τετράχους, what, *Luke* iii. 1.

Τετράχωνος, one *of juſt Stature*, Mat. vi. 27.

Τιμὴ, *Honour* and *Reward*, 1 Tim. v. 17. τιμὴ σίτου, what, *Col.* ii. 19.

Τροχὸς γενέσεως, the wheel of Generation, what, *James* iii. 6. p. 580.

Τυμπανίζειν, what ſort of Torment, *Heb.* xi. 35.

Τύμπανον, whether *a Wheel*, or *a Club*, Ibid.

Τύπος, ſeveral ſignifications of that word, 1 *Cor.* x. 7.

Y.

Ὑακοῦσαι, *to hearken* if any body knocks or calls, *Acts* xii. 13.

Ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ, *ſuperabundantly*, 1 Theſſ. iii. 10.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, *in the room* or *ſtead of thoſe that are dead*, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Ὑπερβαίνειν, whether it ſignify unnatural Filthineſs, 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 6.

Ὑπερέχειν, whether it ſignify the ſupreme Power, *Rom.* xiii. 1.

Ὑπηρῶον, in which the Apoſtles met together, whether in the Temple, *Acts* i. 13.

Ὑπόπτιον & ὑποπτεύειν, what, *Luke* xviii. 5.

Ὑπόδειγμα, *an imitation*, Heb. viii. 5.

Ὑσπέρματα ἀλλήλων χριοῦ, what, *Mark* xii. 44.

Φ.

Φιλόνικος, no Greek word, 2 *Tim.* iv. 13.

Φθινοπωρινὰ δένδρα, whence ſo called, *Jud.* 12.

Φθορὰ, ſignifies ſometimes *Filthineſs*, ſometimes any *Corruption*, 2 Pet. i. 4.

Φρονεῖν γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν, what, 1 *Cor.* iv. 6.

Φρόνησις δικαίων, *the mind of the Juſt*, Luke i. 27.

Φύσις, for natural Light, in oppoſition to Inſtruction, 1 *Cor.* xi. 14.

Φωνεῖν, for σφραγωνεῖν, *to ſpeak to*, John ii. 9.

X.

Χαρὰ, *joy* for a *Feaſt*, Mat. xxv. 21. and xxvi. 7. for a Chriſtian Vertue, *Rom.* xiv. 17.

Χάραγμα ἱερὸν, what, *Rev.* xiii. 15.

Χάρις, for the Goſpel, in oppoſition to the Law, *John* i. 14. p. 183.

Χάρις Χριστοῦ, whether it be *the Charity of Chriſt*, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

Χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, what, *John* i. 16.

Χειροτονεῖν, what properly, what metaphorically, *Acts* xiv. 23.

Χιτὼν, *a Coat*, Mat. v. 40.

Χρηστὰ ἤθη, whether *good Diſpoſitions* or *good Manners*, 1 Cor. xv. 33.

Χρηστὸς, of a perſon, *bountiful*; of a thing, *profitable*, Mat. xi. 30.

Ψ.

Ψαύειδαι τὸ ἄγον πνεύμα, what, *Acts* v. 3.

Ψυχαὶ ἐσφαγμένων, may be *the dead bodies of the Slain*, Rev. vi. 9.

Ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, *a brutiſh ſenſual Man*, 1 Cor. ii. 14.

An INDEX

OF THE

Memorable things contained in theſe Remarks.

A.

Abortive, in a Metaphorical ſenſe, what, 1 *Cor.* xv. 8.

Abraham went from *Charran* during his Fathers Life, *Acts* vii. 4. whether his paying Tithes to *Melchiſedek*, can be thought an example of the preſent Cuſtom of paying Tithes of all that a Man poſſeſſes, *Heb.* vii. 4.

Adoption of Sons, what in *Rom.* viii. 23.

Adramyttium, a Town in *Myſia*, Acts xxvii. 2.

Adultery, the Story of the Woman taken in the Act, whether Genuin, *John* vii. 53. and viii. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10.

Age to come, which, *Luke* i. 70.

Agnoeta, their Hereſy.

Agoniſtical terms, often uſed by St. *Paul*, as *Rom.* ix. 16. 1 *Cor.* ix. 24, &c. 2 *Cor.* iv. 8. 2 *Tim.* iv. 7. *Phil.* iii. 12. but not ſo often as Dr. *Hammond* thought, *Phil.* iii. 12. p. 457, and 458.

Alabaſter box, out of which Chriſt was Anointed, whether broken or not, *Mat.* xxvi. 7. *Mark* xiv. 3.

Alexander the Copperſmith, where he did ſo much evil to St. *Paul*, 2 Tim. iv. 14.

Allegorical interpretations of Scripture, uſed as Arguments, *ad hominem*, to convince the Jews; *Gal.* iii. 16. and iv. 21, 25. cited for the very words of Scripture, *James* iv. 5. *Mat.* ii. 23.

All, put for *ſome*, or *the moſt*, 1 Cor. xiii. 28. p. 348.

Ambiguity of an expreſſion, improved into an Argument, 1 *Pet.* iv. 1.

Angels, their *Tongues*, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 1. appointed to offer up the prayers of Chriſtians, *Rev.* v. 8. *Guardian Angels*, the opinion of the Jews and Heathens about them, and what reſpect Chriſt might have to either of thoſe Opinions, *Mat.* xviii. 10. *Angel of the bottomleſs pit*, who, *Rev.* ix. 11.

Anger, ſeveral degrees of it mention'd by *Ariſtotle*, whether they were referred to by St. *Paul*, Eph. iv. 26, 31.

Antecedent put for the Conſequent, *Heb.* vi. 7.

Antichriſts, more than one, 1 *John* ii. 18. who, *Ibid.*

Antitype, what, 1 *Cor.* x. 6.

Auriſt, in Greek, expreſſive of a Cuſtom, *Mark* xv. 6. *Rom.* viii. 30.

Apoſtles, whether the name it ſelf implies any Authority, *Luke* vi. 13. who were properly ſo called, *Prem. to James.*

Apollyon, who, *Rev.* ix. 11.

Arabians circumciſed, but not in imitation of the Jews, *Gal.* iv. 25.

Areopagus, whence ſo called, *Acts* xvii. 19.

Archippus, whether Biſhop of *Coloſſe* in St. *Paul's* time, *Col.* iv. 17.

Arguments for the truth of Chriſtianity, taken from Prophecies, what we are to think of them, *Mat.* ii. 15. and 1 *Cor.* ii. 4. Arguments of the Apoſtles not always demonſtrative, *Heb.* ix. 16. and xiii. 10.

Armillus, of the Jews, *John* xi. 48.

Athleta, their Diet, 1 *Cor.* ix. 25.

B.

To be Baptized into Chriſt, is to be baptized to the end that we may become Chriſtians, *Rom.* vi. 8. *for the dead*, what, 1 *Cor.*

1 *Cor.* xv. 29. *into* any ones *name*, what, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. into *Moſes*, 1 Cor. x. 2. *in the Cloud* and *in the Sea*, ſpoken of the *Iſraelites*, what. *Ib.* ver. 1. *p.* 332.

Barnabas, his Cabbaliſtical way of reaſoning, 2 *Pet.* i. 5.

Battology, an inſtance of it, out of ſome prayers of the Jews, *Mat.* vi. 7.

Better thing, how God is ſaid to have provided ſome better thing for us Chriſtians than the Jews, *Heb.* xi. 40.

Biſhops, whether included in the commiſſion given by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, *Mat.* xvi. 19. how they differ'd from Presbyters, *Phil.* i. 1. when it is a Sin for a Biſhop to deſert his Office, 1 *Tim.* iii. 1. whether in the Primitive times there were two at once in the ſame City, one over the *Jewiſh*, and another the *Gentile* Chriſtians, 2 *John*, and *Rev.* i. 20. and xi. 3. Biſhops and Deacons, why not mention'd by St. *Paul*, in the Inſcriptions to all his Epiſtles, 1 *Theſſ.* i. 1.

Body of Sin, what, *Rom.* vi. 6.

Bodily exerciſes, in what ſenſe profitable or unprofitable, 1 *Tim.* iv. 8.

Bond of Perfectneſs, why Charity is ſo called, *Col.* iii. 14.

Bread, taken both for Food and Raiment, *Mat.* vi. 11. OUR *Bread*, in the Lord's Prayer, what, 2 *Theſſ.* iii. 12.

C.

Cæſarea Philippi, where, *Mat.* xvi. 13.

Called, its ſeveral acceptations in Scripture, *Mat.* xx. 16. *Many are called but few are choſen*, the ground and meaning of that expreſſion, *Ibid.* and xxii. 14.

Capital Cauſes; whether the Cuſtom of the *Romans* in Capital Cauſes, was obſerved among the Jews, *John* viii. 29.

Captains of the Temple of two ſorts, *Luke* xxii. 52.

Capitol of *Rome*, whence ſo called, *Rev.* xiii. 3. the burning of it under *Veſpaſian* reckon'd a very great Calamity, *Ibid.*

Carnal for weak, 2 *Cor.* x. 4.

Cenſures of the Church, when to be inflicted upon Hereticks, *Tit.* iii. 10.

Chœnix, how big a Meaſure, *Rev.* vi. 6.

To *Chooſe in Chriſt*, what, *Eph.* i. 4.

Chriſt, his Birth, by what means known to the wiſe Men, *Mat.* ii. 2. the time of it, whether in the publick Records in *Juſtin* and *Tertullian*'s time, *Luke* ii. 8. why he would not have it divulged that he was the *Meſſias*, Mat. viii. 4. and withdrew himſelf from the Multitude that would have made him a King, *John* vi. 15. the time of his Death, *John* xix. 14. his Coat of what ſort, and in what manner wrought, *Ibid.* 23. what it is *to be in Chriſt*, 2 Cor. xii. 2.

Chronology of the Antient *Jews* faulty, *Acts* vii. 4.

Church, the uſe of the word in the Apoſtles times, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 19. *Church of God and of Chriſt*, why the Chriſtian Church is ſo called, 1 *Theſſ.* i. 1. *p.* 478.

Churches Apoſtolical, whether all regularly formed, when St. *Paul* wrote to them, *Ibid.*

Circumſtance, omitted in the former part of a ſtory, to be gather'd from what follows, *Act.* xxviii. 22.

Circumciſion, why inſtituted, *Rom.* i. 26.

Citations out of the Old Teſtament, for Ornament ſake, not as proofs, 1 *Cor.* i. 20. places of Scripture often *cited* without Connexion, *Rom.* ix. 28. and xv. 3. the inconveniences of citing Authors upon truſt, *Epheſ.* v. 32.

Cloud, that went before the *Iſraelites*, how they are ſaid to have been *under* it, and *baptized in* it, 1 Cor. x. 1.

Coming of Chriſt, to ſignify his puniſhing the Jews, *John* xx. 22.

Communion of the Holy Ghoſt, what, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14.

Community of Goods enjoyed among ſome Nations, *Acts* iv. 35.

Compel, how God may be ſaid to compel Men to Piety, *Luke* xiv. 23. *compelling* by entreaty or example, *Gal.* ii. 14.

Conjugal Love, compared to the Love of Chriſt and his Church, *Eph.* v. 32.

Conſummation of the Age, what, *Mat.* xxiv. 3.

Council of the Roman Preſidents, *Act.* xxv. 12.

Crown of Righteouſneſs, for a Crown beſtowed in Juſtice, 2 *Tim.* iv. 7.

Cubit of a Man, for an ordinary Cubit, *Rev.* xxi. 17.
Curse, in what sense Christ is said to have been *made a Curse*, Gal. iii. 13.
Cymbals, their form, use, and matter, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 1.

D.

Day of Christ, not always to be understood of the Destruction of the Jews, 2 *Pet.* i 19.
Daily Bread, what, *Mat.* vi. 11.
Darts fiery, what, and why so called, *Eph.* vi. 16.
Deacons in the Church, whence so called, *Luke* viii. 3.
Delivering to Satan, not to be confounded with the ordinary Censures of the Church, 1 *Cor.* v. 5. 2 *Cor.* vii. 8. and x. 4, 5. whether it has any reference to Satan's desiring to have Men deliver'd to him, 1 *Cor.* v. 5.
To *Deny himself*, what, *Mat.* xvi. 24.
Devil, whether any reverence be due to him as a Prince, *Jude* 9.
To *Die unto Sin*, an ambiguous expression, 1 *Pet.* iv. 1.
Diogenes Cynicus his Character, *Luke* i. 67.
To be *Drawn of God*, what, *John* vi. 44.
Drowning, not us'd as a Punishment among the Jews, *Mat.* xviii. 6.

E.

Earnest of the Spirit, what, 2 *Cor.* i. 22. and *of the Inheritance*, Eph. i. 14.
Ebionites, what Hereticks, and whence so called, *Gal.* iii. 1.
Ellipses many in the Apostles stile, *Heb.* iv. 8. how they are to be supplied, *Ibid.* examples of Elliptical expressions, *Gal.* i. 10.
Elxai, a Jew, his Heresy, *Rev.* ii. 4.
Epimenides, why cited as a Prophet, *Luke* i. 67.
Epistles of Recommendation, from one Bishop to another, their original, 2 *Cor.* iii. 1.
Epistle to the *Hebrews*, why rejected for some time, but afterwards admitted, *Heb.* v. 6. *p.* 548. whether written by St. *Paul*, or another, *Ibid.* ix. 2. and x. 34. and xi. 21.
Eternal, why the Gospel so called, *Luke* i. 70.
Evangelists relate the same thing variously, and why, *Mat.* v. 1.
Excommunication ordinary, not to be confounded with the Punishments inflicted by the Apostles, 1 *Cor.* v. 5. 2 *Cor.* vii. 8. and x. 4, 5.
Excommunicate Persons, whether debarred all kind of Commerce with the rest of Christians, *Gal.* i. 8.
Eye, how said to be *evil*, i. e. covetous, or *single*, i. e. *liberal*, Mat. vi. 22. *opening the Eyes*, the meaning of that Phrase, *Luke* xxiv. 16.

F.

Faith, taken in several Notions, *Mat.* viii. 10. the object of it, *John* xxi. 29. *to ask in Faith*, what, *James* i. 6.
Famine foretold by *Agabus*, when it happen'd, *Rev.* vi. 4.
Figs, at what time ripe in *Judæa*, and of how many sorts, *Mark* xi. 13.
The First and the last, why Christ is so called, *Rev.* i. 11.
Flesh; *according to* it, what, *Rom.* iv. 1. *to be in the Flesh*, what, *Rom.* vii. 5.
Fulfilled, in what sense places of Scripture are sometimes said to be so, *Mat.* iv. 14.
Future state, upon what grounds believed by the Heathens, 1 *Cor.* xv. 19.

G.

Gates of Hell, what, *Mat.* xvi. 18.
Genealogy of Christ, why defective in St. *Matt.* and how St. *Matt.* came to divide it into three fourteens, *Chap.* i. 8. Genealogies of the Valentinians, owing to whom, 1 *Tim.* i. 4.
Gentiles, their vocation unknown to the Angels before the event, *Eph.* iii. 5.
Glory of Kingdoms what, *Mat.* iv. 1. *glory* for miracles, *Joh.* i. 14. *glory of God*, for God himself, *Rom.* i. 23. why the *Man* is so called, and the *Woman the glory of the Man*, 1 Cor. xi. 7.
To *Glorify God*, is to confess the Truth, *Luke* xxiii. 47.
Gnosticks, whether they had any reason to fear the *Jews* out of their own Country, 1 *Cor.* iii. 15. and *Prem.* to *Galat.* whether they were the troublers of the Churches in *Galatia*, Gal. i. 7. whether they

they were all ſuddenly deſtroyed with the rebellious Jews, 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 8. whether they abſtained from Wine, or forbad others the uſe of it, 1 *Tim.* v. 22. or attempted to draw away Servants from their Maſters, *Ib.* vi. 2. whether there was any one Sect in the Apoſtles times peculiarly ſo called, *Ibid.* 20.

Gog and *Magog* ſignify the *Turks*, Rev. xx. 8.

Grace for Grace, what, *John* i. 16.

Great God, whether he be ſo called, with a reſpect to the *Cabiri*, or great Gods of the Heathens, *Tit.* ii. 13.

Grotius, his Poſthumous Annotations without reaſon ſuſpected by Dr. *Hammond*, Rom. xiv. 23. and *Prem.* to 2 *Pet.*

Guardian Angels, ſee *Angels*.

Gyges, whether the Kings of *Lydia* that ſucceeded *Gyges*, were ſo called, *Rev.* xx. 8.

H.

Happineſs of Heaven, why repreſented under the ſimilitude of a Feaſt, *Mat.* viii. 11.

Head, the Cuſtom of *Mens* having it *bare*, when they appeared in publick, and *Women*, *veil'd*, 1 Cor. xi. 4, 7. *head of the Beaſt*, which had received *a deadly wound*, to be underſtood of the burning of the Roman Capitol, *Rev.* xiii. 3.

Heart, how *the Law* is ſaid to be *written in* it, *Rom.* ii. 15.

Heaven, whether it can be taken for a name of God, *Mat.* xxi. 25. how it is ſaid to have *opened*, Mat. iii. 16. *to fall from* it, what, *Luke* x. 18. *Rev.* xii. 10. the Phraſe *Heaven and Earth*, whether it ſignifies only this Earth, or ſublunary Region, 2 *Pet.* iii. 7. *all things in Heaven and Earth*, whether they ſignify Men, *Col.* i. 20.

Helleniſts, who, *Acts* vi. 1.

Heretick, properly who, *Tit.* iii. 10. of what ſort to be avoided, *Ibid.* how ſaid to be *condemned of himſelf*, Tit. iii. 11.

Herodes Antipas, Tetrarch of *Galilee*, not *Procurator* of *Judæa*, Mat. xxii. 16. *Luke* iii. 1.

Holy, why the Infants of Chriſtians are ſo reputed, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14.

Hours, how counted by the Jews and the Romans, *John* xix. 14.

Humanely, *to ſpeak* ſo, what, *Rom.* vi. 19.

Husband of one Wife, in what ſenſe it is ſaid a Biſhop ought ſo to be, 1 *Tim.* iii. 2.

I.

St. *James* reconciled with St. *Paul*, James ii. 24.

Idiotick or *rude ſtile*, what, 2 *Cor.* xi. 6.

Idle word, which, *Mat.* xii. 36.

Idolatry, whether always joined with unnatural Luſts, 1 *Cor.* v. 10. 2 *Cor.* xii. 21.

Jeruſalem, when taken, *Mat.* xxiv. 17. whether the Deſtruction of it was ſo very ſudden and unexpected, as is ſuppoſed by Dr. *Hammond*, 2 Pet. iii. 16.

Jezebel, whether it need be underſtood of any Sect of Hereticks, *Rev.* ii. 2.

Jews, their zeal to make Proſelytes became a Proverb, *Mat.* xxiii. 15. acknowledg'd their Deſtruction to be from God, *Mat.* xxiv. 3. the Vengeance taken on them by Chriſt repreſented by his going out to battel againſt them, *Luke* ix. 31. how they hoped for Juſtification by the Law, *Gal.* iii. 10. whether they were in ſo great favour with the Roman Magiſtrates, as to be able to put them upon perſecuting the Chriſtians, 2 *Theſſ.* i. 5. and *Prem.* to *Rev.* whether they were ſo numerous as *Joſephus* affirms, *Rev.* vii. 4.

Image of the inviſible God, how Chriſt is ſaid to be, *Col.* i. 15. and *the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, Heb. i. 3.

Immortality of the Soul believed by the *Platoniſts*, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Impoſtors, how they were to be known in St. *John*'s time, 1 *John* iv. 2.

Impoſſible, for what is very difficult, *Heb.* vi. 6.

Interrogation, equivalent to a Negation, *Mat.* iii. 7.

Joſeph of *Arimathæa*, one of the *Sanhedrim*, Mar. xv. 43.

Joy for a Feaſt, *Mat.* xxv. 21.

Judas his indignation againſt the Woman that anointed Chriſt, what prerence for it, beſides his Covetouſneſs, *Mat.* xxvi. 7. the manner of his Death, *Mat.* xxvii. 5.

Judges, among the Jews, whence they took their name, *Mat.* iii. 2.
To Justify, what in St. *Paul's* diſpute with the Jews, *Rom.* iii. 4.
Juſtin Martyr, his Authority not much to be regarded, 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 4.

K.

Kabbaliſtical interpretations of Scripture, of what kind, 2 *Pet.* i. 5.
Key of David, what, *Mat.* xvi. 9.
Kingdom, whether the condition of the Chriſtian Church could be called ſuch, after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, Rev. i. 6.
Kingdom, which a Nobleman went into a far Country to receive, how to be underſtood, *Luke* xix. 12.
Kings Manuſcript, whether properly a different Copy, or rather a Paraphraſe of the New Teſtament, *Mat.* xx. 29. *Acts* x. 25.
Kiſs Holy, with which the Chriſtians ſaluted one another, *Rom.* xvi. 16.

L.

Labour of Love, what, 1 *Theſſ.* i. 2.
Lake burning with Fire and Brimſtone, whence the Phraſe is taken, *Rev.* xix. 20.
Laodiceans, whether St. *Paul* wrote to them, *Col.* iv. 16.
Laſt days, which, *Acts* ii. 17.
Law, taken in a larger or ſtricter Notion, *John* x. 35. *Law of Sin*, and *the Spirit*, what, *Rom.* viii. 2. *Law of Moſes*, in what ſenſe poſſible or impoſſible to be kept, *Gal.* iii. 10, 11. the *Jews* only freed from the Curſe of it, not the Heathens, *Ib.* v. 13. how it was a Pedagogue to bring us to Chriſt, *Gal.* iii. 24. why called *Elements of the World*, and *weak and beggerly Elements*, Ibid. iv. 3.
Letter of the Law, what, *Mat.* v. 17. *Mar.* xii. 14. *Rom.* ii. 29. 2 *Cor.* iii. 6.
Levi the Publican, whether the ſame with St. *Matthew*, Luke v. 27.
Light, in a metaphorical ſenſe, what, 1 *Joh.* i. 5.
To *Live with Chriſt*, whether it ſignifies to be in Proſperity, 1 *Theſſ.* v. 10.
Lord of Hoſts, why God is often ſo ſtiled, 1 *Tim.* i. 18.

M.

Malchus, a Syrian name, *John* xviii. 10.
Martyrs, their ſeveral denominations for diſtinction ſake, trifling, *Rev.* iii. 14.
Man of Sin, whether the *Gnoſticks*, or the rebellious *Jews*, 2 Theſſ. ii. 3.
Melchiſedek, how ſaid to have been *without Father or Mother*, and to have repreſented Chriſt, *Heb.* vii. 4.
Meſſenger of Satan, what, 2 *Cor.* xii. 7.
Metropoles, their Privileges as to Civil Government, *Rev.* i. 4.
Metropolitans, whether any in the Apoſtles times, *Phil.* i. 1. 1 *Tim.* iii. 15. *Rev.* iv. 4, 6.
Morning Star, for the Doctrin of the Goſpel, 2 *Pet.* i. 19.
Myſtery of Iniquity, whether the ſecrets of the *Gnoſtick* Sect, or the hidden Counſels of the ſeditious Jews, 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 7.

N.

Nard, an Herb or Ointment, and why of great Price, *Mark* xiv. 3.
Name above every Name, what, *Phil.* ii. 9. *to ask in the name of Chriſt*, what, *Joh.* xiv. 14.
Nature, for that which is oppoſed to inſtruction, 1 *Cor.* xi. 14. *by nature Children of Wrath*, ſpoken of the *Jews*, what, *Ib.* and *Eph.* ii. 3.
Neapolis in *Paleſtine*, confounded by Dr. *Hammond* with that in *Macedonia*, Acts xvi. 13.
Number and *name of the Beaſt*, what, *Rev.* xiii. 18. *number of a Man*, what, *Ibid.*

O.

Oaths, why ſaid to be *paid to the Lord*, tho made to others, *Mat.* v. 33.
Offering might be ſaid to be *ſanctified* two ways, *Rom.* xv. 16.
To *Open the Eyes* or *Underſtanding*, what, *Luke* xxiv. 16, 45.
Oracles, whence ſo called, *Rom.* iii. 2. *living*, what, *Ibid.* counterfeit Oracles cited by Dr. *Hammond*, Heb. vi. 9.
Outward darkneſs, what, *Mat.* viii. 12. and xxv. 30.

P.

Paleſtine, whether ſubject to *Syria*, in *Herod* the Great's time, *Luke* ii. 1.

Parables, of Chriſt, whether before vulgarly uſed by the *Jews*, *Mat.* xx. 15. do not always allude to a Cuſtom, *Chap.* xxii. 2. nor obſerve a perfect decorum, *Chap.* xxv. 24. every thing in them not allegorical, *Luke* xv. 22.

Parents, whether Magiſtrates are included in that word, *Eph.* vi. 1, 4.

Paſſions evil, hinder Men from acknowledging Truth, *John* iii. 19.

Paſſive Verbs often uſed in an Active ſenſe, *James* ii. 4.

St. *Paul*, how a Roman Citizen, *Acts* xxii. 25. whether a ſingle Man, 1 *Cor.* ix. 5. ſome of his Writings may be loſt, 1 *Cor.* v. 9. whether converſant in Heathen Writers, 1 *Cor.* xv. 33. whether Eloquent, 2 *Cor.* xi. 6. *Gal.* ii. 6. diſputes with the Jews upon their own principles, *Gal.* iii. 10, 16, 24. *Chap.* iv. 3, 12.

St. *Peter*, how it is ſaid the Gates of Hell and Death ſhould not prevail againſt him, *Mat.* xxvi. 18. whether he propheſied of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, 2 *Pet.* iii. 3, *&c.* the time of his Death, *John* xii. 18. *Prem.* to 2 *Pet.*

Phenice, a part of *Syria*, whoſe Inhabitants were therefore called *Syro-Phenicians*, Mat. xv. 22.

Philippi, a Roman Colony, and Metropolis of *Macedonia*, Phil. i. 1.

Pilate could have put Chriſt to Death without the conſent of the Jews, *Mat.* xxvii. 15.

Platoniſts thought the Devils roved about Mens Sepulchres, *Mat.* ix. 28. believed the Immortality of the Soul, 1 *Cor.* xv. 29.

Plural number, put for the Singular, *Mat.* xxi. 7. and xxvii. 44.

To *Pray in* any ones *name*, what, *Joh.* xiv. 14.

Preexiſtence of Souls, believed by the Jews, *John* ix. 2.

High *Prieſthood*, when joined with the Dignity of Emperor, *Heb.* vi. 9.

Priſoners, the Cuſtom of releaſing them on Feſtival days, *Mat.* xxvii. 15.

Prophecies antient of two kinds, *Mat.* ii. 15. of the Revelations, like the Antient, *Rev.* iv. 2. why ſo obſcure, *Rev.* xiii. 18.

To *Prophesy* of any one, for ſaying what may be fitly applied to him, *Mat.* xv. 7.

Prophets, cited inſtead of an allegorical Interpretation of ſome Paſſages in them, *Mat.* ii. 23. whether they commonly expreſs diſmal things covertly, *Rev.* xvi. 17. among the Heathens, whether they taught the People Vertue, *Luke* i. 67. many falſe Prophets during the Siege of *Jeruſalem*, 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 9.

Prophetical expreſſions, not always to be underſtood in a proper ſenſe; nor every particular Phraſe to have a ſpecial meaning aſſigned it, *Rev.* iv. 2. and ix. 17.

Propoſitions univerſal, for particular, 1 *Cor.* xii. 28.

Publicans, of two ſorts, *Mat.* xi. 19.

Purifying, by Fire and Water, common among the Heathens, to ſignify the cleanſing of the mind. *Mat.* iii. 11.

Python, Spirit of *Python*, what, *Acts* xvi. 18.

R.

Redeeming of time, for delaying, *Rev.* v. 16.

Regeneration, the Stoicks notion of it, *Mat.* xix. 28.

To *Remit* and *retain Sins*, ſpoken of the Apoſtles, what, *John* xx. 23.

Repetitions for emphaſis ſake, 2 *Cor.* xi. 22.

Reſurrection of the dead, whether it ever ſignifies no more than a ſecond State or Subſiſtence, *Mat.* xxii. 31.

Reſt of God, under the Law, the Land of *Canaan*, under the Goſpel, Heaven, *Heb.* iii. 11.

Revelation of the Sons of God, what, *Rom.* viii. 19.

Riches whether promiſed under the Goſpel, 2 *Cor.* ix. 8, 9.

Righteous for *Merciful*, Mat. i. 19.

Right hand of God, where mention is made of ſitting on it, what, *Mark* xvi. 19.

Rock that followed the *Iſraelites*, how it is ſaid to have done ſo, why called *Spiritual*, and how ſaid to have been *Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* x. 4.

Rome, ſtiled a Goddeſs, *Rev.* xiii. 1.

Rude in Speech, how St. *Paul* ſo calls himſelf, 2 *Cor.* xi. 6.

S.

Sacrifices under the Law, whether acknowledg'd by the Jews to be Types of Christ, *Heb.* xiii. 11.

Saints, why Christians are so called, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. why the Jews, *Eph.* ii. 19.

Salt, for wood Ashes, *Luke* xiv. 34.

Salutation, see *Kiss*.

Sanhedrim of the *Jews*, sat in the form of a Semicircle, *Rev.* iv. 4. from them the form of the Heavenly Council represented to St. *John* in a Vision, seems to be taken, *Ibid.* and *vers.* 6.

Satan, for a Man, 2 *Cor.* ii. 11.

To *Save*, taken for *to heal*, Mar. v. 34. *to preserve*, Luke xiii. 23.

Saved so as by Fire, what, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14.

Saviour of all Men, but especially of them that believe, in what sense God is said so to be, 1 *Tim.* v. 10.

Scourging, a servil Punishment among the Romans, not among the Jews, *Acts* v. 41.

Sealed, how Christians are said to be so by God, 2 *Cor.* i. 22. *Eph.* iv. 30. how Christ, *Eph.* iv. 30.

To *See God*, what, *Mat.* v. 8. *Joh.* i. 18.

Sepulchres, whited among the Jews, *Mat.* xxiii. 27. adorning them charged on 'em as a Crime, *Luke* xi. 47.

Simon Magus, his fabulous contest with St. *Peter*, Rom. i. 23. *Prem.* to 1 *Thess.* 2 *Tim.* iii. *Rev.* xii. 7, 9. whether deified by the Romans, 2 *Thess.* ii. 3.

Sin unto Death, what, *John* xi. 4.

Sins of the Men that lived before the Flood, 1 *Pet.* iii. 20.

Solœcisms, many in St. *Paul*'s stile, *Gal.* ii. 6.

Son of Man, who, *Mat.* xii. 8. *of Perdition*, for the wicked Jews, 2 *Thess.* ii. 3.

To *Speak as a Man*, what, *Rom.* vi. 19.

Spirit, for the design of God in the Law, *Mat.* v. 17. *Rom.* ii. 29. 2 *Cor.* iii. 6, 17. for a disposition of Mind, *Rom.* viii. 15. 2 *Cor.* iv. 13. *to be in the Spirit*, what, *Rom.* vii. 5. *Spirit of Bondage*, and *of Adoption*, what, *Rom.* viii. 15. *Spirit of Python*, what, *Acts* xvi. 16. *Spirit of Faith*, what, 2 *Cor.* iv. 13.

Spiritual, who so called by St. *Paul*, *Gal.* vi. 1. *spiritual Meat*, what, 1 *Cor.* x. 3.

Stone, living, whence so called, 1 *Pet.* ii. 4.

Strong Meat, how some Doctrins are so called, *Heb.* v. 14.

To Suffer to the Flesh, an ambiguous Expression, 1 *Pet.* iv. 1.

Sun becoming black, and the Moon as Blood, and the Stars falling, what those Phrases signify, *Rev.* vi. 2. and viii. 11.

To Sup with Christ, and he with us, what, *Rev.* iii. 20.

Sweating by the Head, *Mat.* v. 38. and by the Throne of God, both Heathen Customs, *Mat.* xxiii. 22.

Synecius, a Platonist, 1 *Cor.* xv. 29.

Syrian, a name of Reproach, *John* viii. 48.

T.

Tacitus vindicated from the charge of imputing the burning of *Rome* to the Christians, *Rev.* xii. 6.

Temple, not profaned with Sepulchres, *Mat.* xxvii. 51. two Garisons placed in it, *Luke* xxii. 52.

Thief on the Cross, whether converted in an instant by an extraordinary efficacy of God's Power, *Mat.* xxvii. 44.

Times of the Gentiles, which, *Luke* xxi. 24.

Tongues, the Gift of them and its use, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 2, 5, 10, 13, 14.

Transcribers of the New Testament have sometimes substituted more familiar words in the room of others less known, *Mat.* xiii. 35. 1 *Cor.* xi. 10.

True for righteous, *Rev.* xv. 3. *the true Bread*, *Meat* and *Light*, why Christ is so called, *John* vi. 55.

Truth, to do it, what, *John* iii. 21.

Types and typical significations, the common Doctrin concerning them groundless and vain, 1 *Cor.* x. 3.

V.

Vanity to which the Gentiles *were made subject*, what, *Rom.* viii. 20.

Vespasian, ill compared by Dr. *Hammond* with Christ, *Mat.* xxiv. 3.

Uncleam, why the Children of Heathens are so accounted, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14.

Upper room, in which the Apostles met together and prayed, whether in the Temple, *Acts* i. 13.

Urim and *Thummim*, Rom. iii. 2.

W.

Warfare, in a metaphorical sense, for the sacred Functions of the *Levites*, about the Temple, *Luke* xxii. 52.

Washing the Hands, among the Jews, the occasion of it, *Mark* vii. 2.

Waters, many compared to a multitude of People, *Rev.* xiv. 2.

Weary and *heavy Laden*, spoken only of the Jews, and in what sense, *Mat.* xi. 28.

To *Will*, set after *doing*, signifies to do a thing heartily or *willingly*, 2 Cor. viii. 2.

Will worship, understood in a bad sense by St. *Paul*, but if taken for a lawful course of Piety not commanded, when acceptable to God, *Col.* ii. 19.

Wine of the Wrath of God, what, *Rev.* xiv. 10.

Wise Men, how they knew the Birth and Dignity of Christ, *Mat.* ii. 2. did not understand that he was the Son of God, and therefore gave him only *civil* Worship, *Ibid.* p. 9, 13.

Wisdom of the World, and the Princes of this World, what, 1 *Cor.* ii. 6.

The *Word of God*, for God himself, *Heb.* iv. 12.

Works of supererrogation may be done, but are not meritorious, 1 *Cor.* ix. 17.

work of Faith, for a Work of which Faith is the cause, 1 *Thess.* i. 2.

Z.

Zacharias slain between the Temple and the Altar, which, according to Mr. *Le Clerc*, Mat. xxiii. 35.

FINIS.

Books printed for Sam. Buckley, *at the* Dolphin *in* Fleetſtreet.

AN Inquiry concerning Virtue, in two Diſcourſes. I. Of Virtue, and the belief of a Deity. II. Of the Obligations to virtue. 8°.

Latitudinarius Orthodoxus. I. In Genere, de Fide in Religione Naturali, Moſaica & Chriſtiana. II. In Particulari, de Chriſtianæ Religionis Myſteriis. Sancta Trinitate. Chriſti Incarnatione. Corporis Reſurrectione. Cœna Dominica. Acceſſerunt Vindiciæ Libertatis Chriſtianæ, Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, & Arthuri Bury, S. T. P. contrà ineptias & calumnias P. Jurieu.

Voyages and Diſcoveries in *South-America*. The firſt up the River of *Amazons* (which runs a Courſe of above 1200 Leagues thro the fineſt Country in the World, not yet planted by the Europeans) to *Quito* in *Peru*, and back again to *Brazil*, perform'd at the Command of the King of *Spain*, by *Chriſtopher D'Acugna*. The ſecond up the River of *Plate*, and thence by Land to the Mines of *Potoſi*; by Monſieur *Acarete*. The third from *Cayenne* in to *Guiana*, in ſearch of the Lake of *Parima*, reputed the richeſt place in the World. By M. *Grillet* and *Bechamel*. Done into *Engliſh* from the Originals, being the only Accounts of thoſe parts hitherto extant. The whole Illuſtrated with Notes and Maps. 8°.

An Account of Monſieur *de la Salle*'s laſt Expedition and Diſcoveries in *North-America*. Preſented to the *French* King, and publiſh'd by the Chevalier *Tonti* Governor of Fort St. *Louis* in the Province of the *Iſlinois*. Made Engliſh from the *Paris* Original. Alſo the Adventures of the Sieur *de Montauban*, Captain of the *French Buccaniers* on the Coaſts of *Guinea* in the Year 1695. 8°.

Monſieur *De Pointi*'s Expedition to *Cartagena*: Being a particular Relation, I. Of the Taking and Plundering of that City by the *French*, in the Year 1697. II. Of their Meeting with Admiral *Nevil* in their Return, and the Courſe they ſteer'd to get clear of him. III. Of their paſſing by Commadore *Norris* at *Newfoundland*. IV. Of their Encounter with Capt. *Harlow*, at their going into *Breſt*. Engliſh'd from the Original publiſh'd at *Paris*, by Monſieur *De Pointi* himſelf. And Illuſtrated with a large Draught of the City of *Cartagena*, its Harbour and Forts.

The French Perfumer; teaching the ſeveral ways of Extracting the Odours of Drugs and Flowers, and making all the Compoſitions of Perfumes for Powder, Waſhballs, Eſſences, Oils, Wax, Pomatum, Paſte, Queen of *Hungary*'s Water, *Roſa Solis*, and other Sweet Waters. The manner of preparing ſweet Toilets, *Boxes*, *&c.* with the Preparations and Uſe of Perfumes of all kinds whatſoever. Alſo how to Colour and Scent Gloves and Fans. Together with the Secret of cleanſing Tobacco, and Perfuming it for all ſorts of Snuff, *Spaniſh*, *Roman*, &c. *Done from the Original Printed at* Paris. The Second Edition, wherein all the Faults that happened in the firſt are Correſted.

☞ The Hiſtory of *Don Quixote*, newly Tranſlated out of *Spaniſh* by ſeveral Hands, with Sculptures, in *Folio*, is in the Preſs, and will be publiſh'd with convenient ſpeed.